Published on the 15th of the month

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific
LIBRARY

Vol. XXIX, No. 4 JULY, 1939

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
'They are at it Again!'	169
The Need for Lay Theologians	171
Problems of Religious Teaching in the Schools	172
The 'Fundamentalist-Modernist Scandal' in Dissent	175
Psychology and Christian Doctrine — R. J. Stanford, M.A.	181
The Christ Myth — P. R. Smythe, M.A., B.D.	188
Mithraism and the Christian Sacraments — John Todd, M.A.	194
Citations and Excommunications according to the Canon. A. Atkinson	197
Book Reviews:	
Nazism and Romanism	205
The Christian Hope of Immortality	209
Rudolph Otto and the Gospels	211
Two Commentaries and a Study	215
Spiritual Therapeutics	217
An Eye Opener	218
In Memoriam—William Stuart McGowan	219
Correspondence — Cremation and the Creeds; Reliability of the Record of the Teaching of Jesus; Browning and Modern Thought; Holiday Conference, &c.	220

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net. Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

KING'S COLLEGE
(UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)

(DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY)

Dean—The Rev. Preb. RICHARD HANSON, M.A., B.D.

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY.

The Degree of B.D. in the University can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' study, and by other Matriculated Students after three years.

Theology may also be taken as one subject for the B.A. (General) Examination.

The Associateship of King's College is an officially recognised equivalent of the General Ordination Examination. It can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' Theological study; by others who have passed certain examinations at school, or later, after three years' study.

Post-graduate work in Theology for M.Th., Ph.D. and D.D. is directed by each Professor.

There are Exhibitions both for Graduates and for other Students.

King's College Theological Hall, Vincent Square, Westminster, offers the advantages of residence.

Women Students are admitted to the Theological Department to read for the B.D. or the Lambeth Diploma (S.Th.).

STAFF.

Dogmatic Theology and Evidences.
Rev. HERBERT MAURICE RELTON, D.D., Professor.

Hebrew and the Exegesis of the Old Testament.
Rev. Canon S. L. BROWN, D.D., Professor.
SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor
Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor Emeritus.
Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

Syriac, Aramaic and Rabbinical Hebrew.
Rev. Canon S. L. BROWN, D.D., Professor.
SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor.
Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Professor Emeritus.
Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

Exegesis of the New Testament.
Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, B.D. (Cantab.), Professor.
EDWYN R. BEVAN, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., Hon. Lecturer.

Ecclesiastical History.
Rev. F. E. CROYDON, M.A., Lecturer.

Patristic Texts.
Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, B.D. (Cantab.), Lecturer.
Rev. E. G. JAY, M.A., Lecturer.

Pastoral and Liturgical Theology.
Rev. OSCAR HARDMAN, M.A., D.D., Professor.
Rev. CLEMENT FRANCIS ROGERS, M.A., Professor Emeritus.
Rev. GEORGE BEACONSFIELD ENDERS, B.A., B.D.
Rev. ROBERT LINTON SHIELDS, M.A., D.Mus., A.R.C.M., Lecturer.

Philosophy of Religion.
THE DEAN.
Rev. F. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Lecturer in Comparative Study of Religions.

Ecclesiastic l Art.
Rev. C. B. MORTLOCK, M.A.

Tutor to Women Students of Theology.
Miss M. D. GROSVENOR, B.D.

Chaplain: Rev. R. L. SHIELDS, M.A., D.MUS., A.R.C.M.

FEES	£32 a year.
Evening Classes	£15 15s. 0d. a year.

There is no entrance fee.

Residence at Hall	£66 a year.

For full information apply to THE DEAN:
KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

'They are at it Again!'

We could have wished that we had heard the last of the protest made by the 8,206 clergymen who signed a petition to the Church authorities protesting against their acceptance of the *Doctrinal Report* and asking for a declaration

> 'That the Church of England holds and teaches the Nicene Creed in that sense only in which it has ever been held throughout the history of the Church';

and that the Church's ministers

> 'cannot rightly claim a liberty to set aside by private interpretation the historic meaning of those clauses which state the events of the earthly life of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

What, however, the petitioners lack in tolerance they supplement by tenacity. Their representatives—of whom the two chief were Fr. W. B. O'Brien, S.S.J.E., Superior General of the Cowley Fathers, Oxford, and Mr. C. M. Chavasse, Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford—were received by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York on May 22 at Lambeth Palace. The purpose of the interview was to secure from the Primates a declaration which the Upper Houses of the Convocations had refused to give. The petitioners, as those suffering from distress and

pain, were kindly received by the Primates, but of course the desired authoritative declarations were not forthcoming.

Instead, a long statement was subsequently issued (June 3) by Dr. Lang and Dr. Temple 'speaking for ourselves.' This document (published in full in the *Church Times* of June 30) reaffirms the position taken by the Church authorities in June, 1914, and propounded in the notable declaration of Archbishop Davidson. That declaration was at the time regarded by the leading Modernists as an archiepiscopal act of toleration granting to them a reasonable and reverent freedom for their studies and teaching, and we shall be making no mistake if we interpret the most recent archiepiscopal declaration in the same sense. That position was admirably expressed at the time by Professor Gwatkin, the well-known Cambridge theologian, in a reply to Bishop Gore's *Open Letter*. Dr. Gwatkin wrote :

> 'Scholarship will always correct the errors of scholarship, provided only we do not call in authority to cut the knot. The false gospels of yesterday are forgotten to-day, and those of to-day will follow them to-morrow. We need only a little of the patience and trust in truth which are so conspicuously wanting in an appeal to authority. Nor does History give much encouragement to such a method as you propose. Convocation, to which your friends appeal, is not famous for the temperate and judicial character of its action, and there is no reason to think it would make fewer mistakes now than it has commonly done in past time.' *

In the quarter of a century which has elapsed since this was written, some ardent Modernists may have felt disappointed that no further advance on the road to doctrinal freedom has been made by authority. We ourselves are satisfied with the situation created by the firm and courageous resolution of the Bishops that there shall be no step backwards in this matter. The very existence of the *Doctrinal Report* and its acceptance by the Upper Houses of the Convocations is the most convincing proof of the judicious use of that doctrinal freedom which has been the treasured possession of our English Modernists during the last five-and-twenty years.

It seems to us deplorable that in this time of national stress and strain our traditionalist reactionaries should be seeking to divide the Church on the issue of doctrinal tolerance. Should they succeed—and it is impossible that they can succeed—what

**The Modern Churchman,* Vol. IV, No. 3, June 1914, pp. 108-109.

good can they hope to secure by their success? They would only narrow the comprehensiveness of the Church of England; reduce the number of its members; diminish its influence with the nation; and prevent a number of scholarly Christian men, who really know at first hand the intellectual difficulties of the present situation, from entering the ministry of the Church. It is not without sorrowful significance that the *Church Times*, in a leading article of June 30 in support of the malcontents, indicates that it has lapsed once more from its Liberal-Catholic policy.

The Need for Lay Theologians.

Mr. Arnold Nash in the *Spectator* of June 23, writing on the teaching of religion, asserts that

> 'What is needed is a movement of lay theologians conscious of their aim and purpose as Christian intelligentsia to bring unity with freedom to an intellectual world which has gone adrift.'

Apparently clerical theologians are suspect as being more concerned to grind their theological axes than to wield the sword of moral and spiritual truth. The lay teacher of religion is believed to have the primary qualification of an open mind without which truth can neither be acquired nor imparted. It is a tragedy for the Church if things be so with its clerical educationists, for it means either that the Church is to lose its authority as a truth teacher in the sphere of religion and ethics or else it must substitute laymen for clergymen in its class rooms, professorial chairs, and pulpits. Would it not be better for the Church so to train her clergy that as teachers of religion they might be heard with as much confidence as if they were laymen? Of course, if this is to be done, it demands that the clergy shall be free men and not be bound in their teaching by subscriptions to traditional formularies. We must secure a free pulpit if the Church is not to lose all authority as a teacher of religious truth in the coming age. 'If the conclusions be prescribed,' wrote Archbishop Frederick Temple, 'the research is precluded'; and not only so, but the authority of the teacher of the conclusions is discredited. If the Church gives complete freedom to the pulpit, is she not exposing herself and the faithful to great danger? Yes, and no. Yes, if she admits into the pulpit teachers who have not been thoroughly trained in the subjects which they have to teach and

who in their character and conduct are not loyal to the principles of the Christian life. If the Church admits into the pulpit well trained religious educationists whose personalities reflect their Christian principles, she has nothing to lose, but much to gain, by giving them complete freedom. We are not at all opposed to a large increase of competently trained laymen to teach religion, especially in our universities and schools, but if we are not to have a serious setback to the influence of the Church as a teacher of religion, the Church herself must secure two things which to-day are largely lacking: (1) a body of clergy who are competently trained teachers of religion, and (2) absolute intellectual freedom for them in the exercise of their teaching office. The times are ripe, and over-ripe, for this gift of freedom based upon the possession of competent educational training. Without this gift of freedom the Church cannot recover her influence as a teacher of religious truth in this scientific age.

Problems of Religious Teaching in the Schools.

The dire weakness of the religious teaching given in so many of our schools, and the growing recognition that without religious education we must suffer from a serious decline in national character and conduct, are becoming increasingly recognized by thoughtful citizens. A leading article in *The Times* of June 24 produced a series of interesting letters on this subject, the most important of which, in our estimation, was contributed by Dr. Basil Yeaxlee, of the Department of Education in the University of Oxford. Dr. Yeaxlee wrote:

> The normal parent wants the school to educate his children in character as well as in knowledge. He still connects religion with this, but vaguely, and as a kind of guarantee. He thinks of religion as the commonly accepted way to live a good life. He recognizes and values what he regards as the English tradition of justice and freedom. This he tends to cherish the more strongly as he sees what is happening in totalitarian States, and he is slowly awakening to two facts. One is that if Christianity is rejected a substitute takes its place, and such substitutes are powerful. The other is that English good form and public spirit are rooted in Christian principles, though for the last fifty years this has been increasingly forgotten.
>
> A few *intelligentsia* have taken the attitude of the headmaster quoted by the Headmaster of Malvern [who said in reply to criticism of the inadequacy of religious instruction given in his school, 'The age of faith is dead. Why do you want to revive it?']. But they too are realizing that the deeper psychology goes, the more it reveals religion as native to human nature and a faith as essential to the complete de-

velopment and the full effectiveness of human personality. They are beginning also to understand that their notion of Christianity and of the Bible is out of date.

There is much evidence that parents, especially young parents, wish to discuss religious education with those who teach their children, and frequently do so at Parent-Teacher Association gatherings. They are concerned not only with what the school does but also with the part which, as they perceive, they themselves must inevitably play in the religious and moral upbringing of children. They confess to a great degree of ignorance about what the Bible is and teaches. They respond with great readiness to the provision of opportunities of 'objective' study (to use the word as the Spens Report does) afforded by University Extension and Workers' Educational Association courses and classes provided by local education authorities in co-operation with these bodies, with other voluntary organizations, and with qualified ministers and clergy. This is strikingly illustrated by the experience of the Loughborough College Department of Extra-mural Studies, co-operating with the Leicestershire Education Committee, and working through a representative council set up to co-ordinate all efforts towards adult religious education in the area. During the last year, while there was a decline in the number of classes in other subjects, those in the study of religion, which in two or three years had become a remarkably large proportion of the whole, more than held their own.

Parents and teachers are both asking for more help in the study and understanding not only of the Bible but of the Christian religion in relation to other great religions and philosophies and in their bearing upon life. Sixth-form pupils and undergraduates are asking penetrating questions and taking genuine religion with a new seriousness. The title of the new Cambridgeshire Syllabus is surely right and timely. It is a Syllabus of Religious Teaching.

Two very clear conclusions emerge. All forms of religious education — that of parents and teachers as well as of undergraduates and school pupils—should be promoted as parts of one enterprise. Every effort should be made to implement the recommendations of the Spens Report in its notable chapter on Scripture, where the right of every child to know that there is a religious interpretation of life is asserted, and competence, objectivity, and sincerity in teaching are emphasized.

Your reference to the bugbear of tests for teachers is admirably forceful. That the history of elementary education since 1870 has given lamentable reason for lingering suspicions is all too true. But the case has been otherwise in secondary education. Why cannot there now be 'parity' between schools under elementary regulations and those under secondary in the sense that Scripture may be taught at any time in the day, and therefore by those who are prepared and have qualified themselves in some measure to teach it? There is no fear of victimization or hindrance to promotion on the part of secondary teachers who for any reason at all do not wish to teach Scripture. Many headmasters and headmistresses of secondary schools do not teach Scripture and have never taught it. The 1936 Act has made it a matter of law that all children in elementary schools should in one way or another receive religious instruction unless their parents have a conscientious objection to religion altogether. The next Education Act should remove the now unnecessary clause of the 1870 Act requiring that in elementary schools Scripture must be taught at the beginning or end of the morning or

afternoon session, which in practice means the first period in the morning and commonly necessitates participation by all the teachers in the school.

Christianity is either, at best, a useful illusion or it is the truth about God and man. If it is the latter it must inspire and penetrate education through and through. Parents do not want it eliminated from the teaching or the life of the schools. The corollary is that teachers who wish to undertake the teaching of Scripture as the Spens Report describes this should have the best equipment possible and an adequate provision of time for it in the school time-table. But in the interests of both Christianity and democracy every teacher should be genuinely free to say that he does not wish to teach Scripture, and assured that he will suffer no more disadvantage than if he says that he is neither interested in geography or mathematics nor qualified to teach them. As a matter of psychological fact, of course, whatever 'subject' he teaches he will unconsciously and inevitably reveal, especially to older pupils, the nature of his own religion or religion-substitute, whatever that may happen to be.

What Dr. Yeaxlee writes is excellent and breathes the upper air of that new religious world which is dawning in England, in which the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth is the object of religious research and devotion rather than the dogmas and doxies of contending Christian and anti-Christian sects. But, alas! the actual situation is far from being so fully developed. There certainly ought to be no tests for teachers in religion except the test of adequate knowledge and of competency in imparting it. And of course no teacher should be compelled to teach religion or be penalized if he does not teach it.

That the actual state of things, especially in our Church schools and training colleges, is not all that could be desired in this respect is indicated by the following letter from Canon Braley, Principal of St. Bede's College, Durham, published in *The Times* of July 3:

In your admirable leading article of June 24 you use the term 'tests for teachers,' if I may say so, in an untechnical way. The phrase has been appropriated by the teaching profession to mean something quite different. To them it means the contravention of Article XVII of the Code '. . . the teacher shall not be required to perform any duties except such as are connected with the work of a public elementary school . . .'

In a Church newspaper of quite recent date I observe the following requirements in advertisements for elementary teachers: 'Keen churchwoman, communicant, preferable Anglo-Catholic'; 'Practising churchwoman essential—Anglo-Catholic, Organist if possible.' Now 'tests for teachers' of this kind have been tried over and over again, and always found ultimately worthless. You can multiply hypocrites, but you cannot guarantee efficiency by these means.

Your explanation of the phrase, 'that the work of religious teaching should be limited to those who are adequately versed in the subject, and convinced of the faith which they have to impart,' would I imagine be endorsed by the large majority of the teaching profession. Its great organ, the National Union of Teachers, has stated that it is 'concerned to ensure that religious instruction shall not be given except by those who feel able and willing to give it.'

Your contention that teachers ought to be better equipped to give religious instruction is certainly true. I am convinced that no advance can be made until religious knowledge is included in the list of five subjects which may be chosen for the Teachers' Certificate. All the religious instruction that students in training colleges receive to-day, in Church and L.E.A. training colleges, is additional to their preparation for the certificate examination. Experience shows that students are apt to regard the subject as an extra, and to grudge the time that has to be given to it — since it reduces the time at their disposal for the final examination. That is to say, that in order to be able to teach religion adequately, a student must jeopardize his chance of success in the Teachers' Certificate Examination.

We hope that our Church educational authorities will take early and effective action to remedy the defects and abuses which Canon Braley stresses. It is clear that the Church to-day needs to give far more care and money to the adequate training of teachers in religion. The recent suppression of the Truro Training College is one of those lamentable incidents which suggests that in some Church quarters the building of Church schools is regarded as more important than the giving of adequate religious training to teachers.

The 'Fundamentalist-Modernist Scandal' in Dissent.

The Church problems with which thoughtful and sincere Dissenters in this country are being faced at the present time are treated in a poignant and arresting manner in two recently published volumes.* These are *Essays in Orthodox Dissent* by B. L. Manning and *The Necessity of Christian Modernism* by T. Wigley.

Mr. Manning is a well-known Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, who combines the duties of College Bursar and History Tutor. His volume consists of a number of addresses delivered to assemblies of Dissenters. These discourses have a fine quality of style and are a pleasure to read. Like a good

* *Essays in Orthodox Dissent.* By Bernard Lord Manning, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. (Independent Press. 5*s.* 1939.)
The Necessity of Christian Modernism. By T. Wigley, M.A. (James Clarke & Co. 5*s.* 1939.)

conversationalist, Mr. Manning invites agreement and provokes disagreement in quick succession, and is brilliant and pungent. Mr. Manning claims to be an orthodox Dissenter of the High Calvinist type. He does not define his orthodoxy, and as he is not a trained theologian he is probably much less orthodox than he knows. Dr. Hastings Rashdall, a trained theologian, after having discovered in strenuous dogmatic controversy that some of our English bishops who were most convinced of their own orthodoxy were in some cases Apollinarians, in other cases Tritheists, in other cases Patripassians or Theopaschitians, sorrowfully declared that for them, and for many others who shared their 'orthodoxy,' the only heresy in their eyes was disbelief in miracles. Mr. Manning does not disclose his convictions on any of these dogmatic issues, and his certificate of orthodoxy signed by himself, read in the light of his addresses, indicates that he is a good Christian man who feels that Bishops are a menace to the Christian religion, more redoubtable, but not less detrimental, than Modernists. Mr. Manning could tolerate Church government by Bishops, although his own experience of episcopal government has not led him to value it highly; still, it might be accepted as 'a tolerable ineptitude,' to use a phrase coined by Mr. Manning's arch-saint, John Calvin: but what Mr. Manning cannot accept at any price is salvation by Bishops. This, he rightly perceives, is what underlies episcopal claims to-day. As a High Calvinist he can accept the Ignatian *dictum*, 'Outside the Church there is no salvation'; but he cannot accept the Ignatian correlative, 'Where the Bishop is, there the Church is.' In holding fast to these convictions, particularly that the Bishop is a 'Bite-sheep,' Mr. Manning is loyal to his Calvinist Congregationalist heritage.

If the Church of England could abolish its Bishops or draw all the episcopal eye-teeth, Mr. Manning would find himself able to dwell in it, provided it were not Erastian; and, at this point, it is gratifying to note that Mr. Manning does not necessarily identify Establishment with Erastianism as so many less well-informed and clear-headed people do. As a High Church Calvinist, he maintains that the Church is the co-equal of the State, and in a real Christian theocracy, its superior. The Church therefore may accept establishment by the State. What it must

not do is to accept control by the State. His grievance with the Church of England is that it accepts control, and this is what renders it Erastian. Nevertheless, Mr. Manning recognizes—and here he finds himself between the horns of a dilemma—that the only power in England which can hold in check the Prelacy of the English Church is Parliament. Here we find ourselves where Oliver Cromwell and his friends found themselves, but with an important difference. Mr. Manning is tolerant: his Congregationalist or Independent or Puritan ancestors were not. Oliver Cromwell was a remarkably tolerant man for his age—more tolerant than Archbishop Laud—but, said he on a memorable occasion, 'If you think I will tolerate the Mass, I tell you, Nay.' On the other hand, the Quakers found, in New England, that they had less comfortable conditions under the Puritans, than under the Bishops in the homeland. The public flogging of Quaker prophetesses in the New England towns by the Puritan authorities, indicates how little religious toleration there was in that fanatical age. But Mr. Manning—and here he shews himself a good Modernist—is for complete toleration. Give the Truth but room and give it time, and it will prevail. It needs no external forces, no legal restraints, to secure its victory. In this we hear the authentic note of the greatest of Puritans, John Milton.

Mr. Manning does believe in the power of the Christian Gospel as of the very essence of Truth, and he does believe in the free Grace of God, uncontrolled by ecclesiastical legalism and clericalist institutions. He does not think little of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; but the free Grace of God flows into human hearts and purges and inspires the consciences of men by many other means, and pre-eminently by the preaching of the Word.

We, as Modernists, have no complaint to make against Mr. Manning in these matters, except it be, perhaps, that he is a little too complacent, and a little too rigid. But he has very serious complaints to make against Modernists. This is most forcibly expressed in his own words:

> 'Our doctrine of the Church makes irrelevant and meaningless the squalid controversy now raging in almost every denomination except ours between the so-called Fundamentalists and the so-called Modernists. A Congregationalist does not know whether he has more sympathy or more contempt for each party. He has no doubt of his overwhelming desire to be well rid of both. What is the cause of this

squalid controversy? It is at bottom a failure to understand that the Church is made and maintained by grace, that grace is sufficient, but also necessary, for its life; that doctrine is not something which the Church protects, but that it is something which protects the Church. Men still think in terms of law. They apply the methods of the old dispensation to the problems of the new.

For we need not deny that there is a problem behind the Fundamentalist-Modernist scandal. It is the problem of re-stating the faith in the light of new knowledge. The new knowledge, to be sure (such of it as is both new *and* knowledge), is far less than many suppose. It is mainly our own ignorance of our fathers in the faith which makes us fancy them and their problems so very unlike ourselves and our problems.

Some in the Evangelical and some in the Catholic school are afraid that modern thought will end by offering an enervated, bowdlerised substitute for that which has been the glory alike of Catholic and of Evangelical saints: that Christianity outside the Roman fold will be watered down to that unsatisfying humanitarianism which a shrewd undergraduate more than fifty years ago saw as the probable issue of certain tendencies in his pastors and masters. That undergraduate was Cecil Spring-Rice, and a saucy letter of his written in 1878 from the Oxford Boat Club makes my point better than I can. He is describing Jowett, Master of Balliol: and, for all his greatness, Jowett was the herald of many of the most deplorable features in modern Protestantism:

> "Life here gets very uneventful. The only thing that makes one day different from another (except fish and porritch on alternate mornings) is our debating society and the sermons. I have heard three of the last from our Master. Doesn't he seem to begin at the wrong end? 'The Mosaic books are not wholly unhistorical': 'Purity is better than orthodoxy, wise persons than sectarians.' 'The gospel facts may or may not be accurate, but there is no doubt that honesty is the best policy.' Moses and Job and Solomon and Christ lived and died that their lives might suggest to Dr. Jowett sundry platitudes and truisms, and if the facts are not exactly and correctly stated, why, they make a very edifying allegory: in which Dr. Jowett's young friends may live and move and have their being. 'Swollen with wind and the rank mist they draw.' Fancy Oliver Cromwell told to take the *Pilgrim's Progress* instead of the Bible to fight for: 'it was equally true and considerably more edifying.' I do not love thee, Dr. Jowett: which is very ungrateful, for he has been very kind to me: and has devoted his whole life to doing young men good—especially young women."

If the Fundamentalists are nervous lest the Church should lose one part of its inheritance, the fullness of the faith, the Modernists are nervous about losing the other half, Christian liberty. They are in irritable terror lest any positive affirmation of faith should block future access to truth. Say nothing too definite now, lest the future should be shocked. And if the Fundamentalist brutally has recourse to law, the Modernist more meanly has recourse to legal fiction. His principal anxiety appears to be to show how little it is necessary for a Christian to believe. A rising Cambridge Anglican exponent of this school lately preached a sermon in which it was noted that the Name of the Redeemer occurred not once, and the word *God* only once in a description of a state of things now happily passed away. . . .

> This hideous legalistic controversy about what is the indispensable minimum of belief offends the conscience of all Christians. It causes the common enemy to triumph. It convinces many friendly men that when Zion is burning we are content to measure the size of the throat of the fish that swallowed Jonah and to debate whether Q wrote the Gospels or only another man of the same name. It is hateful, and it is worse than hateful: it is useless. The Fundamentalist, for all his violence, cannot exclude the Modernist: and the Modernist, for all his protestations about the sacredness of all truth, is suspected by the plain man of living a lie and selling the gate he is sworn (and paid) to defend. A situation hateful, useless, and unfair to good men on both sides. . . .
>
> Let the Fundamentalist learn that no standard of faith can be so drawn that any Modernist worth his salt cannot drive a coach-and-four through it without a scratch on his conscience. Let the Modernist learn that no revision of standards can ever satisfy any but the modest man who takes on himself to revise them. The words of all of us will appear out-of-date to-morrow, and we may just as well reconcile ourselves to it: but the triumphant orthodoxy of the soul that knows its Redeemer liveth is not a foe to liberty nor is liberty a foe to it. God's truth, like God's service, is perfect freedom' (pp. 110-115).

If we turn to Mr. Wigley's *The Necessity of Modernism* we can find another and more attractive aspect of Modernism presented. Mr. Wigley, like Mr. Manning, is a stout Congregationalist: like Mr. Manning, he is a graduate of the University of Cambridge—the English academic defender of the Reformed Faith—but, unlike Mr. Manning, he is a pastor and not a don. He ministers to a Congregationalist Church at Blackheath, and, being an outspoken Modernist, is known in Congregationalist Traditionalist circles as a Blackheathen—perhaps *the* Blackheathen.

Mr. Wigley is more closely in touch than is Mr. Manning with the intellectual, moral and spiritual difficulties and needs of modern middle-class men and women, living and working in a great city. His volume opens on a familiar note:

> 'Modernism is an attitude of mind rather than a body of ascertained truth, it is concerned with method rather than results, its authority is that of the scientific mind rather than that of the dogmatic. . . . The Modernist, therefore, while gladly conserving what is true and valuable in the past, rejects the outgrown, re-states the received, and looks forward to further discovery and to the fuller satisfaction of needs new and old, intellectual, moral and religious. In an ever-changing mental and cultural environment neither religious nor any other kind of thought can remain static and continue to be effective. . . . The heritage of the Christian modernist is no mean one: it is not confined in ecclesiastical or dogmatic treasure chests, rather it is the attitude of the seeker who, believing that God is in every age revealing Spirit to those who seek Him in sincerity and truth, commits him-

self to those spiritual ways in which the divine and human meet and mingle in an enlarging life.'

Mr. Wigley, like all vigorous Modernist teachers to-day, is convinced, not that our Christian religion, but that our Christian theological system, is out of date, and that it must be reformulated if the Christian religion is to recover its influence in the modern world. He cites Principal Selbie, one of the most thoughtful of Congregationalist theologians, in support of this contention :

> 'The need for re-statement is urgent and we must address ourselves to it with greater boldness than has been shown hitherto, and with a fresh and more sympathetic insight into the needs of the average modern mind. The very existence of organized religion depends on its capacity to undertake this task' (p. 117).

For Mr. Wigley, the Modernist is concerned, not as Mr. Manning charges him with discovering what is the minimum of Christian belief, but with what is true in Christian belief. For, as Mr. Wigley maintains—and he cites in his support another notable Congregationalist teacher, Dr. C. J. Cadoux—'only what is true is an essential part of the Christian Faith.'

Mr. Manning's view that dogmatic re-formulation is needless because such re-formulation must quickly become out-of-date means either that the Church must dispense with the use of all dogmatic formulae or else only use formulae which are out-of-date. Neither of these alternatives commends itself to the Modernist. The Modernist's *tertium quid* is that the Church should re-state the fundamental truths of the Christian Faith in the simplest and clearest language possible. If this were done now the Church would free herself from the charge of teaching error in the name of Eternal Truth and, on the other hand, would enable quite simple people to learn what the Christian Faith really demands from them in the sphere of Christian conviction. *Non multa sed multum* (Not many things but much) should be, and we believe is, the ideal of Modernist re-statement. That there is urgent need for the Church to re-establish its reputation as a Truth teacher is the conviction of Bishop Rawlinson as cited by Mr. Wigley :

> 'It is hardly too much to say that the Christian Church must establish a new tradition of intellectual honesty and of veracity before she can hope once more to command the confidence of the modern world in her capacity as a teacher of spiritual and religious truth' (p. 158).

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

By the Rev. R. J. Stanford, Pilsley Vicarage, Chesterfield, Derbyshire.

THERE is a well-known utterance of Frederick Temple, recorded in his 'Life' (Vol II, p. 517),

> 'Our theology has been cast in the scholastic mode, that is, based on logic. We are in need of, and we are gradually being forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain. But nothing can prevent it.'

How is this transition to be made? What does it involve? What results are to be expected from it?

We may properly ask, first, what is the peculiarly psychological point of view. In the words of James Ward, psychology is 'the science of individual experience,' so that for the psychologist Christian doctrine will be the attempt to describe and to account for certain facts of personal experience. Psychology knows nothing of reality as it is, but only reality *as felt*; it cannot therefore consider as other than sterile any attempt to construct a philosophy from *a priori* assumptions, for it is never possible to eliminate the part which is played by the mind of the observer in his commerce with the world, and this is true of even the simplest perceptions.

If, for example, we apply this principle to the accounts which have come down to us of the historic events from which Christian doctrine took its origin, we shall see clearly that they do not give us the events of the life of Jesus as they were in themselves, and in their true historic significance; nor is it possible by any process to discover what these events were. We can only know the impression which they made on the minds of contemporaries. Even if we ourselves had been companions of Jesus in Palestine we should have been little better off. Instead of the evangelists, it would then have been we who should have been called upon to evaluate the things we saw done, and the conversations we heard, and to select those which we thought to be significant. It is impossible to get rid of selection and evalua-

tion in any narrative of events, and it is impossible to be sure that the selection and evaluation have not to some extent misrepresented what occurred. Thus, while on the one hand we may ask ourselves how our doctrines would have been affected if the event which we call the Ascension had not been recorded, or if the conversation about divorce had not been thought worth remembering; on the other, we may be quite sure that there were other events and conversations which would to us seem of outstanding importance, but of which the significance was missed by those who were actually present. We must not, then, construct a system of doctrine upon the records in the Gospels as though these contained the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

In actual fact, of course, a considerable body of doctrine had already been formulated before the Gospels were written. And if we ask whence it arose, the answer must be that it arose from the individual experience of Christians; that it was an attempt to rationalize and give coherence to that experience. If there be any priority, then it must be said that experience comes first; though it would be more correct to say that experience and doctrine develop together. It is probably true that there is no experience without any cognitive element, and the recognition and development of the cognitive element undoubtedly clarifies and shapes experience, and brings to a focus what might otherwise remain nebulous and ill-defined. But it is more important to recognize that without a living experience there would have been no call to make doctrines at all, and that where the related experience is absent, doctrine is meaningless. To the 'natural man,' as St. Paul realizes, doctrine is 'foolishness.' That is a curious fact. From St. Paul's day to this, in spite of the labours of the greatest intellects, there has been no successful attempt to weld Christian doctrines into an unassailable and logically convincing system. Arguments about religion notoriously lead nowhere; the 'proofs' of Christian doctrine never have won over anyone who was not ready to be convinced beforehand. Why does religious language differ in this respect from scientific language? Provided he can understand the words that are used, and that his intelligence is sufficient, the 'natural man' does not call the propositions of geometry or the demonstrations of

physics 'foolishness.' The answer is that the language of religion is symbolical; that is to say, it is of the nature of poetry.

Poetry is written from the heart to the heart. It can only be understood by the mind that is emotionally prepared to receive it. Michael Drayton writes of the unappreciative reader of his verses,

> 'I marvel not thou feel'st not my delight,
> Who feelest not my fiery touch of love.'

Similarly, it ought to cause no surprise that Christian doctrine is unintelligible to one who does not look upon the world as it were through Christian eyes. As with poetry logical criticism of the statements it makes is beside the point, so it is with the statements of religion. If we choose to consider as plain prose, the lines

> 'The moving waters at their priest-like task
> Of pure ablution round earth's human shores,'

we shall conclude that they are absurd. But they are not prose; they are poetry. And to some minds they convey in their context truth: not, indeed, the sort of truth that is conveyed by scientific statement, but truth none the less, and of a kind which cannot be conveyed in a different way. But it is only some minds which can receive that truth. The man in whom such lines strike no responsive chord will never be convinced of their value by argument designed to demonstrate the truth of their logical content. Fortunately, where poetry is concerned no one would attempt to arouse an admiration for Keats in that way; yet in religion that is exactly what is done. The arguments for the existence of God, for example, are of the nature of attempts to state in prose what cannot be stated in prose. The search for God along the lines of intellectual demonstration is doomed to failure, and brings only weariness and disillusion. To such as would attempt this road, St. Paul's warning is in season: 'Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy.' The psychological approach will teach us to look beneath the surface of doctrinal statements to truths of the heart which they shadow forth. It will teach us to distinguish between what the language of religion *says* and what it *means*.

It is the failure to make this distinction which makes so much theological writing unfruitful; and the error is as common with

the stiffly orthodox as with his Modernist opponent. So great a work as, for example, Rashdall's *Idea of the Atonement*, extremely valuable historically and critically as it is, is defective constructively in that the author neglects to enquire what was the religious and moral experience which underlay the doctrinal formulations of the great theologians of the past. In actual fact, any language which may be used in setting out the doctrine of the Atonement is first of all an attempt to describe and explain an experience. Discussion of the doctrine of the Atonement should therefore be rather directed to asking what is the value of the experience, and what are the conditions under which it is evoked, than to logical criticism of the formulae which express it. In India, for example, Stanley Jones has found that hundreds of seekers after God have found through Christ that reconciliation with Him which they could attain in no other way. The analysis and classification of facts of experience so discovered is the psychological and fruitful way to criticize the doctrine of the Atonement. And if we would understand the language of the Fathers on this or any other doctrine, we must bear in mind that there is underlying their theories, however remote or even distasteful these may be to us, a living experience; and it is to that experience that we must try to penetrate. Sometimes one gets glimpses of it:

> 'Nostra quippe et ipsius conjunctio nec miscet personas nec unit substantias, sed affectus consociat et confoederat voluntates.' [1]

There is the language of experience. Or again, from William Law:

> 'Christ given *for* us is neither more nor less than Christ given *into* us. He is in no other sense our full, perfect and sufficient Atonement, than as his nature and spirit are born and formed in us.' [2]

It is not possible in a short paper to attempt to cover the whole range of Christian doctrine. But were it possible, I believe it would be found true that every vital doctrine arises from and attempts to interpret an inner experience of a profound kind which must in some degree be shared before the doctrine can be understood. The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ obviously attempts to interpret a value-judgment which each man must make for himself. Unless he really does reverence Christ as

[1] Cyprian: cited Hooker, V, ch. vi, § 9.
[2] Law: cited Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 280.

supreme, the doctrine can mean nothing to him, not even if nominally he accepts it. A man may go about saying (and believing) that Shakespeare is the greatest poet, merely because he does not question what he has been told by others. But in this case the belief will mean nothing for his life. On the other hand, if he really does love and reverence Shakespeare, even if he is not prepared to commit himself to the opinion that Shakespeare is the greatest of all poets, he will be far nearer to the essential truth of the matter than he will be if he accepts the dogma but has no experience of the love.

Again, we may argue that the Fall was an historic fact, or a pre-cosmic fact; or that in reality it was not a Fall but a rise—the attainment by life to the levels of self-consciousness and self-criticism. If we are speaking to one whose spiritual eyes are closed we shall not carry any conviction whatever our arguments may be. The one thing necessary, before any discussion of the matter can be other than futile, is the personal knowledge and experience of sin, explain it how we will. For religion, the recognition of that fact is of supreme importance. For religion, though not for theology or philosophy, it is of much less importance that any particular theory of the Fall should be accepted, or even that any at all should be so much as understood. It was by a true instinct that Mr. Bunyan let Mr. Feeble-mind into the Celestial City.

If we would found our theology on psychology, then, we must accustom ourselves, when we examine any doctrine, first to look for the facts of present experience which that doctrine enshrines; and in teaching, it is that which we must emphasize. Only so can the doctrines become intelligible to modern men. The non-Christian, reading that 'He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty,' is hardly to be blamed if he concludes either that Christians are men of weak intellect; or that they are self-deceived, lulling their critical faculties asleep in a garden of dreams; or that they are actually dishonest, maintaining what they know to be very insecurely founded as a matter of history, and plainly repugnant to modern beliefs about the structure of the universe. But let such a one become impressed by observation and reading and experience with the enduring and world-wide influence of the Spirit of

Jesus, no longer limited by time or space, but operating among men the most diverse in race, tradition, natural endowment and custom, and the doctrine of the Ascension and the Session will at once become rich in meaning and full of the truth of high poetry. It has to be recognized that the statements of doctrine are not to be thought of as comparable with the statements of physical laws, but as statements designed to express an experience of which the cognitive element is only a part, and not the chief part.

No doubt the Archbishop was right in thinking that the transition to the psychological point of view would not be easily made. But in so far as it is made, certain valuable results follow. In the first place, the difficulties of Christian teaching are eased. Everyone who has tried it knows how almost impossible it is to teach Christian doctrine to children, or to unlearned adults. It is necessary both to be simple and at the same time to avoid giving rise to the most woeful misconceptions. It is easy to be correct and unintelligible, or to be simple and to promote heresies; but to be simple and correct demands a genius in exposition which few teachers possess. But if we remember that 'teaching doctrine' really means opening the minds of our pupils to the great human experiences of God, of holiness, of righteousness, of sin, of redemption; that it means making them aware of the momentous consequences which hang upon their daily lives, lived well or ill, of their eternal destiny, then much of the difficulty disappears. We know well how difficult it is for the greatest intellects to fit these experiences into any satisfying and coherent philosophy of an intellectualist stamp; but fortunately we know, too, that simple Christian folk can live comely and satisfying lives without being perplexed by the philosopher's difficulties, nor need we be dismayed if their expressed beliefs seem to us somewhat crude. To give a simple example (the illustration is borrowed from R. G. Collingwood), we need not be afraid of teaching children that they have a loving Father above the skies. As a scientific statement that is untrue. But it is not a scientific statement. It is poetry, or myth. After all we are still speaking symbolically if we say that the universe is friendly to man, or that the Logos is incarnate in man. But while the first statement may evoke the desired response in children,

and will convey a meaning of a kind, the other two statements will certainly not do either.

Again, the transition to the psychological point of view may well prove to be a great peace-maker. Do we not often suspect when men appear to differ most widely in their expressed opinions that they really 'mean' the same thing under different forms of words? And even when this is not true, an appreciation of the true nature of doctrine should enable us to live quietly with those whose views differ from our own. Each of us finds that there are parts of doctrine which he can understand in a more than merely verbal sense; which are to him significant and important; and as experience grows wider and deeper, so other parts, which formerly were remote and cold, making no appeal to the heart, begin to live and glow. Each man has had knowledge of this growth of understanding in himself. Yet we still see those who remain blind to some point of doctrine attacking those to whom it is precious on the shallowest grounds, never troubling to penetrate below the surface, to the underlying significance, or to remind themselves that their own beliefs can be attacked from the same standpoint and with the same show of reason by unbelievers. If we could realize the limitations of our own insight; if we could avoid quarrelling about terms, but rather go behind the terms to the living experience which those terms but imperfectly symbolize, we should surely save much futile argument, and perhaps be better able to help one another along the path of richer devotion and fuller understanding.

There are some words of Coleridge which may fitly sum up the view of doctrine which we have attempted to put forward :

> 'I am firmly convinced that no doctrine was ever widely diffused among various nations and in successive ages, and under different religions . . . which is not founded either in the nature of things or in the necessities of our nature. . . . And the more strange or contradictory such a doctrine may appear to the understanding or discoursive faculty the stronger is the presumption in its favour: for whatever satirists may say, scholiasts imagine, the human mind has no predilection for absurdity. I do not mean that such a doctrine shall always be the best possible representation of the truth, on which it is founded, for the same body casts strangely different shadows in different places and different degrees of light; but that it always does shadow out some such truth and derives its influence over our faith from our obscure perception of that truth.' (*Table-Talk* : Oxford Edn., p. 359.)

THE CHRIST MYTH*

By the Rev. P. R. Smythe, M.A., B.D.

THE intellectual discredit into which the Christian religion has fallen in many quarters has been due rather to a change in mental climate than to any successful attack. The absence of such a successful attack is a little puzzling, but if anti-Christian literature is examined in any bulk, the reason for its feebleness is to be found in the ignorance of its exponents, who, though often men of culture and penetration, have seldom troubled to furnish themselves with a theological education, either of the traditional or the modern kind. If it be possible to say so without offence, there are plenty of clergy who could state a better case against Christianity; the defender may know the weaknesses of a fortress better than the besieger.

A curious aberration of anti-Christian thought is furnished by the Christ Myth theory. Christianity is disliked and so is explained away by the proposition that its nominal founder never existed. There are many historical difficulties about Christian origins, but they are scarcely simplified by the belief that it is all an ingenious fake; it seems a little easier to hold that the Roman Empire was converted by honest fanatics than hoodwinked by a cult which has as little historical basis as Mithras and his bull. Christianity may have been presented as a mystery cult to those familiar with such cults. Mythological elements may have attached themselves to a historical figure about whom genuine information was too scanty. Yet the reality of the figure which has suffered such accretions is not to be doubted. In the Middle Ages certain personages of classical antiquity suffered translation into the realm of myth. Theodoric the Goth became Dietrich of Bern; Vergil was remembered chiefly as a magician. An Arabian legend collocates Iskander Khan (Alexander the Great) and the prophet Elijah on the same flying carpet. The collocation and the carpet are alike legendary, but the conqueror and the prophet were both historical personages, however disgusted they would have been with each other's society had that been chronologically possible.

* *Did Christ Really Live?* By H. G. Wood. (S.C.M. Press. 1938. 5*s*.)

The acceptance of the Christ Myth theory would be to align Christianity with the Mystery Religions. Dr. Angus (*The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*, pp. 94 *ff.*) emphasizes that the historical existence of Christ was what distinguished Christianity from these cults. Christianity was a view of the world and a way of life with the inestimable advantage over all its competitiors of possessing an historical and personal centre in the person of Jesus, which saved nascent Christianity from evaporation in excessive apocalyptic emotionalism and which later, in the life-and-death struggle between history and metaphysics in Gnosticism and in the Christological controversies, preserved for all ages a concrete, convincing reality. This unique Personality proved potent to awake moral enthusiasms and release spiritual powers in many lives, and remains the perennial means of renewal through the course of Christian history. Jesus could never be presented as an abstraction or reduced to a beautiful myth.

In an eminently practical age, when incarnate examples of human perfection were sought as guides to conduct and inspirations to high endeavour, it is obvious that Christians had an immense superiority of appeal in the character, life and ideals of one who had actually lived within recent times and died a martyr death, 'crucified under Pontius Pilate.' When an earnest Stoic could despairingly ask of his ideal Wise Man, 'Where is he to be found whom we have sought for so many ages?' the Christians could point to one who was not only Lord in the cult, but the Elder Brother in a numerous divine family (*Romans* viii, 34). The difference in point of appeal and relativity to everyday life stands out in stark contrast in the statements of two contemporaries, that of Plutarch, 'This (Wise Man) is nowhere on earth nor has he ever been,' and that of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, 'The Logos became flesh . . .'

There is the truth of myth, and there is the truth of historical fact. And it is just here that Christians could point with a sense of triumph to their historical Master, who in the universality of His personality was superior to their historical examples like Socrates, and who in His historical tangibility was superior to their mythical Heracles and the Great Mother, and Serapis. In the myth of redemption the passion of Dionysus was symbolism

or legend, but the passion of Jesus was real. In the last analysis Jesus was an historical person whose character needed no burnishing and whose ideals were beyond criticism; but there never was a Mithra, and he never slew the mystic sacramental bull. In the cults of His competitors it was the religion that made the myth and the deity, but it was Christ who made Christianity, not Christianity which made Christ, however much mythical elements were superimposed upon His person. If the Christ Myth school is right, the distinction which Dr. Angus draws is false and meaningless.

The ancient world was familiar enough with Euhemerus' theory that the gods were promoted men, and the apotheosis of rulers, dead and living, was a contemporary fact. In the Synoptic Gospels it is possible to trace an Adoptionist Christology whose logical outcome was the rendering of full divine honours. Or it is possible to follow the other New Testament Christology given us by SS. John and Paul, that Jesus Christ was the pre-existent Son of God become incarnate. Adoptionism was easy for the Greek mind to grasp. Had not Heracles been a hero before he became a god? In any case deity was cheap in the days of deified emperors; one god more or less mattered little. Nor was the conception of incarnation altogether strange. Apollo had lived for some time on earth as a shepherd. The gap between human and divine was not impassable in either direction. In ecstatic cults the god and the worshipper were identified. Bacchic mystics were Bacchi and Bacchae; enthusiasts were those who had the god inside them. But the Christ Myth school refuses to go so far even as the Docetae, who held that Christ's bodily actions and sufferings were intended merely to deceive those with whom He associated into thinking Him truly human. The Christ Myth school is strictly Monophysite; it will have it that Jesus Christ was purely divine, but divine in the same sense as Jupiter and Mumbo Jumbo, and never had a human existence at all.

But to refer to a Christ Myth school suggests a unity of standpoint which is lacking. Mr. Wood complains (p. 142) that criticizing the Christ Myth is not unlike punching a feather bed; a padded cell might furnish an apter parallel. In his little book Mr. Wood has not attempted to discuss the various and conflicting theories of various criticis of this school, though in his first

chapter he mentions most of the works dealing with the topic. He chooses to examine in detail the conclusions, not always consistent, set forth in a series of books by the late J. M. Robertson. It is perhaps unfortunate that he made his choice, since a more recent and readable presentation of the theory has been propounded by M. Couchoud in his little work on *The Enigma of Jesus*, which Mr. Wood allows to be a fresh, vital and readable book, 'the only volume on the Christ Myth that can be read with genuine pleasure' (p. 144). However, in the *Hibbert Journal* MM. Couchoud and Loisy have been debating the point, and a summing-up by the Rev. L. J. Collins appears in the current (April) number.

Mr. Wood does not regard the Christ Myth theory as solely due to mental aberration. The recognition that the Gospels do not furnish inerrant history, but a theological interpretation of the life and death of Christ, is at least half-way to a belief that they furnish no history at all. The discovery that the Gospels tell us much more about the primitive Church and less about the historic Jesus affords at least some support to the hypothesis that Jesus Christ was a figment of the primitive Church. Again, the many modern lives of Jesus furnish a warning against the trustworthiness of the Gospels. Modern writers tend to read their own ideas into the records of Jesus. No doubt this is a tribute to Jesus as an ideal figure, but it is more important to realize that Jesus belonged primarily to His own age, so that only part of His teaching is relevant for later generations confronted with other problems. Nevertheless the large element of historical doubt which must attach to our knowledge of Jesus need not entirely vitiate the records. The most radical of New Testament critics have commonly been willing to allow that Jesus suffered under Pontius Pilate, even when they have rejected every other clause in the Creed. The Christian Myth theorists might be invited to consider with some care Schmiedel's 'Pillar Passages,' those statements which he allowed to be genuine because they conflicted with the later conception of the divine, perfect and inerrant Christ.

Again, some regret that Christianity has a historical and not a philosophical basis. Historical events may not be more than probable and become less probable with the lapse of time. In any case religious truths become bound up with local and tem-

poral limitations. The eternal verities are best disengaged from such hindrances. These considerations may appeal to those of a philosophic bent, especially to Platonists, but a purely theistic religion would not have won much popular support. A religion must have a theological foundation, but to the popular mind the foundation is best out of sight; other elements — moral, ceremonial, social — interest it more.

Mr. J. M. Robertson's main theory is that the Crucifixion story is a perversion of a rite of human sacrifice, for which he attempts to adduce various historical parallels, mainly from outside the Roman Empire. There is adequate evidence that human sacrifice was practised in the Mediterranean world, but the difficulty is that the custom had long since been abandoned as barbarous. The stories of Isaac and Iphigenia indicate the substitution of an animal for a human victim. The last instance of human sacrifice that I can recollect in Roman history occurred during the panic produced by the successful invasion of the Gauls. In Gaul and Britain the Druidic rites were suppressed, contrary to the usual Roman practice of religious tolerance, because they included the sacrifice of captives. That human sacrifice is compatible with a high standard of culture is indicated by its prevalence when the Spaniards conquered Mexico, but the Roman Empire had outgrown that barbarity. Sacrifice was part of ancient religion, but in effect it largely meant that the butcher's trade was carried on under religious auspices. In any case the Passion story is clearly that of the arrest, trial and execution of a criminal, and it is impossible to believe that under this is hidden the account of the sacrificial death of a mock-king. Again, Jesus was named after the ancient hero Joshua, but Mr. Robertson is not satisfied with so obvious an explanation. Joshua has to be made into a god, for which there is no evidence in the O.T., and Jesus has to be identified with him. Judaism has to relax into a polytheistic stage contrary to the whole course of its religious development.

The Christ Myth critics are entitled to hold that the Gospels are vitiated as historical evidence by the miraculous element so prominent in them, that those who believed in such miracles would believe in anything; they are then at liberty to propound their own reconstruction of events as a work of historical detection, but they are not entitled to use the existing Gospels as

the basis of their investigation and then to state that they mean something wildly different from what they record.

Modern radical criticism of the Gospels does not support the Christ myth. Mr. Wood quotes appositely from Dibelius :

> 'If the life of Jesus had been first conceived as a myth and had gradually been transformed into history, the essential element in such a presentation would have been the sequence of the separate events. Only from their succession could the mythical interconnection result. We have seen, on the contrary, that the sequence of the separate sections is wholly unessential in the account of the ministry of Jesus. The several Evangelists have changed the sequence at their discretion. Such accounts as have been preserved of the life of Jesus, apart from the story of the Passion, were detached pictures, to be used in preaching as desired, always related to faith, but quite unlike that appearance of entirety that characterizes a myth. Thus the method of form-criticism enables us to recognize that the beginnings of the story of Jesus are not embedded in myth, but have their foundation in actual events.'

The Anglican priest at his ordination is required to answer in the affirmative the question, 'Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word?' How many priests could say that they had observed this promise? In many cases they might confess that they were unequal to the task, largely because they had neglected the subsequent promise to study. Even worse, the theologically-minded layman may frequently detect in the pulpit 'erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word,' uttered by the preacher in the full conviction of their orthodoxy. Polemical theology is unpopular, except in those parts of England where there is a large Roman Catholic population. But the need to correct error is as great as ever, especially in view of the increasing ignorance of Christian principles and the uprising of semi-Christian cults. It is a false charity to leave a congregation uninformed of the errors of Christian Science or of Spiritualism. Perhaps sermons confuting the Christ Myth might raise for simple people more doubts than they solve, but the placing of Mr. Wood's admirable volume in church bookstalls would prove no small benefit to the educated laity.

MITHRAISM AND THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS

By the Rev. John Todd, M.A., Rector of Waterstock,
Lecturer in Hebrew at Ripon Hall.

IN the conflict of religions in the early Roman Empire, next to the Roman imperial cultus and Judaism, the most formidable of the rivals of the Christian religion were the Mystery Religions. Of these, perhaps the most influential was that of Mithras, the Phrygian mystery, particularly popular among the Roman soldiery and celebrated by Rudyard Kipling in *Puck of Pook's Hill*. The general tendency amongst scholars treating this conflict of religions in the Roman Empire is to assume that the Christian religion was not a little influenced, especially in its sacramental practice and teaching, by the Mystery cults, and not least by that of Mithras. The view of the Christian Fathers was very different. Justin Martyr, in a well-known passage written about 150 A.D., states that demons had inspired the Mithras cultus to imitate the Christian religion particularly in the case of the Eucharist, where, however, a cup of water was used instead of the mixed chalice.[1] In view of what follows with regard to the sacrament of Baptism, it would seem that there is more to be said for Justin's conclusion than for its opposite.

Baptism—we are apt to forget it nowadays—not the Eucharist, was *the* great sacrament of the Christian religion. The *Taurobolium* was the great sacramental rite of the Mithraic Mystery. In celebrating this rite the divine Mithras, wearing the Phrygian cap (which seems to be identical with the red cap of liberty of the French revolutionaries), sacrifices a bull, as shewn in contemporary sculpture. Hepding has attempted to reconstruct what took place at the *Taurobolium*. The candidate

[1] 'For the Apostles in the memoirs which they composed, which are called Gospels, thus delivered that command was given them — that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, This do in remembrance of me, this is my body: and that He likewise took the cup, and after He had given thanks said, This is my blood, and gave of it only to them. Which the evil demons imitated, commanding it to be done also in the mysteries of Mithras: for that bread and a cup of water are set forth with certain formulae in the ceremonial of initiation, you either know or can learn.' — *Apology* i, 66.

about to be initiated into the Mithraic Mystery entered a grotto, descended into a ditch within the grotto, listened to the lament for the dead god, received a baptism of blood, saw a wonderful light and heard the joyful words, 'Be of good cheer, ye initiates, since the god is saved: for to us also shall there be salvation out of our troubles.' The candidate arose out of the ditch a new man 'reborn for eternity.' Hepding admits that this reconstruction is hypothetical. 'I am well aware,' he says, 'that this account of the Phrygian mysteries is, in its details, largely hypothetical. In view of the paucity of information which has come down to us, nothing else is possible.'

The *Taurobolium* is in some particulars analogous to the Christian ceremony of Baptism, and Sir James Frazer, in describing the *Taurobolium*,[2] seems to choose words and phrases with the express intention of conveying the idea that such a relationship between these two rites actually existed. He asserts that a man who has undergone the *Taurobolium* 'has washed away his sins in the blood of the bull.' How significant is the connection between the shedding of blood and the remission of sins! But it cannot be too often pointed out that all our evidence for the *Taurobolium* is post-Pauline. The earliest reference to the *Taurobolium* comes from the second century A.D. It occurs in an inscription found at Pozzuoli, now in the museum at Naples, and its date is 134 A.D. The oft-quoted phrase '*in aeternum renatus*' ('reborn for eternity') is only found once,[3] and that single occurrence is late in the fourth century (376 A.D.), when Christianity had already become the official religion of the Roman Empire. This phrase '*in aeternum renatus*' is quoted by writer after writer, and the impression is given that the phrase is of frequent occurrence and represents a widespread belief.

Dill in his *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (p. 547) says: 'On many of the last inscriptions of the fourth century, the greatest men in the Roman aristocracy leave the record of their cleansing in a curious phrase—"*renatus in aeternum*."' Later (p. 558) in the same book Dill writes: 'A considerable number of monuments in Italy and the provinces commemorate the graphic occasion of one "born again to eternal life."' Again (p. 610): 'The inscriptions of the 4th Cent. which

[2] *Adonis*, etc., p. 229. [3] C.I.L., Vol. VI, No. 510.

commemorate the holy rite often close with the words "In aeternum renatus."' Even Cumont seems to have made a slip and to have exaggerated the frequency of this phrase. Writing of the *Taurobolium* he says: 'The vogue obtained in the Roman Empire by the practice of this repugnant rite can only be explained by the extraordinary power ascribed to it. He who submitted to it was "in aeternum renatus" according to the inscriptions' (*Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, p. 68). Dr. Angus, who has written the fullest account of the mysteries in English, makes the same mistake in connection with this phrase: 'The effect of this consecration,' he writes, 'was . . . rated so high that many of those who had undergone this baptism have left testimony upon their sepulchral stones of having been "renati in aeternum"' (p. 95). Dr. Kennedy in his *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* (p. 94) writes: 'Various inscriptions describe the baptised as . . . "in aternum renatus."' Dr. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, in his *History of the Early Church* writes: 'The worshipper stood in a pit covered with boards on which a bull was slain, so that the blood trickled down upon him and he emerged from its baptism "regenerated for ever."' Dr. Kidd adds a note, '"renatus in aeternum" is a phrase frequent in the inscriptions,' but he gives no references, although in his preface, speaking of the need of references, he says 'such references it has been my object to supply.' Dr. Rashdall, in his Bampton Lectures (p. 480) writes: 'One of the most remarkable of these initiatory ceremonies was the famous *Taurobolium* . . . in which the worshipper stood in a pit and was drenched with the blood of a bull . . . and was said to be "born again for eternity."' Dr. Percy Gardner writes: 'In Roman inscriptions one sometimes reads how such and such a man was "re-born to eternal life"' (*The Growth of Christianity*, p. 123); and in his *Religious Experience of St. Paul* (p. 105): 'In Roman inscriptions we sometimes read that so-and-so was by a baptism of blood "born again to eternal life."' In *The Legacy of Rome* (p. 259) Dr. Cyril Bailey writes: '. . . the *Taurobolium* in which the novice baptised in bull's blood emerged, as we learn from many imperial inscriptions, "in aeternum renatus."' Duruy the French historian of the Roman Empire, gives a description of the *Taurobolium* which is practically a translation of Pruden-

tius' tenth poem in the *Peri Stephanon* (Vol. V, p. 703). He too introduces this phrase, although it is not found in Prudentius. Dill in his account of the *Taurobolium* refers to Duruy. Dr. Kennedy in his account refers to Dill. Rashdall in his account refers to Kennedy — and so the snowball grows!

Thus a myth has grown up around the phrase '*in aeternum renatus*,' and even scholars of the first rank have helped to spread the error that the phrase is of frequent occurrence and corresponds to a widespread belief. I have checked every reference in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* bearing on the subject and find that the phrase occurs only once, and that this solitary instance belongs to 376 A.D.

So far from the Mysteries of Mithras having influenced Baptism as practised in Primitive Christianity, the evidence seems to suggest that Christianity has here influenced Mithraism. This solitary phrase seems to represent the last defiant cry of an expiring paganism, as though the particular initiate, who had this monument erected, knew the beliefs and practices of Christianity and, jealous of Christianity, declared that his religion was as good as this newly-adopted religion of the Empire, for his religion, too, could bring eternal life to men.

CITATIONS AND EXCOMMUNICATIONS ACCORDING TO THE CANON

IT is remarkable that only two of the canons of 1603 find place in the Prayer Book and thus acquire a statutable force not given to the rest of the code. The rubric before the Communion Service provides that the bishop shall proceed 'according to the canon' against an offending person who has been repelled by the curate. Presumably Canon 109 is meant, 'notorious crimes and scandals.' The other canon, No. 31, is found in the preface to the Ordering of Deacons and regulates the seasons for ordination. This has given no trouble and is observed in practice by the bishops: the former has given a great deal of trouble and is habitually disregarded. It is for this

reason, perhaps, that they have thought well to drop it from the Revised Book of 1928. Had this Book received the sanction of Parliament there would have resulted a momentous alteration in the law. The right of the parishioner to receive the Communion depends primarily upon the Statute I, Ed. VI, c. 1, which provides that the curate may not without lawful cause refuse it to any who 'devoutly and humbly desire it.' This right, of such tremendous importance, has always been most carefully safeguarded by the judges and is also the purport of the rubric, which enacts that neither the curate nor the bishop is to be the final judge but reserves the decision to a competent court. 'The bishop *shall* proceed': he is not left with the option of proceeding or not as he likes, nor is he required to give any directions to the curate. The rubric provides an interim arrangement only. Were it otherwise the bishop might privately admonish the offender by letter or word of mouth to abstain from presenting himself at the altar for an indefinite period, thus making himself, rather than the court, the final arbiter, and giving the alleged offender no opportunity for defence. Indeed, it was reported in the press some two years since that a bishop in the Southern province had done this very thing. But the words 'citations and excommunications' clearly imply that the excommunication is to be preceded by a legal process, and Canon 123 lays down that 'no act be sped but in open court'; to which may be added by way of additional confirmation the words of Article XXXIII: 'That person which by *open* denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off,' etc.—*open*, not secret. The same limitation is provided in the Ecclesiastical Courts Act, 53 Geor. III, c. 127, 1813, which is now the governing statute, superseding the old law, 5 Eliz., c. 23. By the former statute a new writ *De contumace capiendo* was substituted for the old writ *De excommunicato capiendo*, and it was provided by Section 2 that nothing shall prevent 'any ecclesiastical court from pronouncing persons to be excommunicated on definite sentences pronounced as spiritual censures for offences of ecclesiastical cognizance.' The sentence is to be *definite*, and in *court* where it may be determined whether the alleged offence is of ecclesiastical cognizance or not. This statute resulted from the imprisonment for two years of Miss Martha (or may be Elizabeth) Dix, who, meeting her

neighbour Mrs. Duffy in the streets of Bristol, had assailed her with coarse and indelicate language, casting aspersions on her chastity. When Miss Dix failed to appear at the church of St. Mary Redcliffe to do penance in a white sheet with bell, book and candle in accordance with the order of the Consistory Court, she was sentenced to prison by the King's Bench. Her plight attracted the attention of Sir Samuel Romilly, then parliamentary candidate for Bristol, who secured her release. This was the last sentence of excommunication followed by imprisonment, the term of which is now limited to six months. It is obvious that a sentence of excommunication, by which a person is stigmatized as a 'notorious evil liver,' may damage his material prospects, as, for instance, in the case of a doctor, who would certainly lose his professional credit. Moreover, if the sentence is not pronounced in open court there is no appeal from the ecclesiastical judge to the courts of the Crown, which is one of the distinguishing marks of the Royal Supremacy.

In the Revised Prayer Book there is a new provision in the rubric adopted from Canon 27 : the curate is 'to obey the order and direction of the bishop.' Suppose, however, the bishop's direction is wrong in point of law, the curate will not be exonerated merely because he has obeyed the directions of his superior. There should certainly have been inserted a provision safeguarding the curate from suit or penalty in any court provided his obedience to the bishop is proved.

The bishops are now apparently endeavouring to supersede both rubrics and canons by regulations of their own. It would have been better had they moved an amendment to this effect to Mr. Herbert's Bill. It should, therefore, be noted that the bishop is not empowered to take action until the curate reports to him an act of repelling. If the minister admit a divorced person to the Communion he is under no obligation to inform the bishop. It would certainly be hard on the clergyman if, after considering all the circumstances, he should repel a parishioner against his own judgment out of loyalty to the bishop and then find himself involved in a hazardous and costly suit. The powers of the bishop, though seriously curtailed by the legislature, have never been abrogated; indeed, they have been expressly retained except in so far as restricted by law. The restriction has

come about for the most part by the establishment of the dissenters' way of worship. The accused has only to affirm that he dissents from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England to be exempt from the citations and excommunications of the bishop. But the establishment of a new constitution under the Enabling Act of 1919 and the formation of church electoral rolls in every parish has vitally affected the constitutional position, for there are now some three and a half million persons who are precluded from setting up this defence since they have made voluntary declaration that they are not dissenters, and so by consensual agreement have promised obedience *in foro conscientiae* to the regulations of the Church—'the godly discipline' the restoration of which 'is much to be wished.'

From the bishop and the layman let us return to the position of the minister, now rendered so difficult by the passing of the recent Marriage Act. The bishop being bound by the canon, it might have been expected that the curate should be bound in like manner, but this is not so. There is no mention of the relative canons in his case, as, for example, Canons 26 and 27, 'Notorious offenders' and 'Schismatics.' Instead another set of rules, giving general directions for his guidance, is provided in the rubric. The lawful causes for repulsion are three: (1) Notorious evil living; (2) the giving of offence to neighbours by word or deed so that the congregation is offended; (3) persistently living 'at variance' with neighbours. There is here a reminiscence of the time when confession was habitual. The minister who, under seal, has knowledge of scandalous conduct can take no notice of it unless it becomes 'notorious.' He can only 'call and advertize' the party and leave the decision to his own conscience and the man to his God. The repulsion is not primarily for the purpose of punishment, but to preserve the spiritual gain accruing to those who partake of the sacrament in common, whose soul's health will be injured by the presence of unworthy participants. And it is always to be considered by the curate whether the conscience of the congregation is offended; not his own or the bishop's. Espionage is no part of his duty; but neither is it likely that he will be called upon by the court to produce *affidavits* from parishioners affirming that they have been offended. The position is difficult for the minister, but the

general question which he will be well advised to ask is whether the conduct of the parishioner is such as has been universally condemned by the moral sense of Christendom. This, for example, could not be said of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which was always permissible by dispensation and against which there was no bar in seventeen of our colonies before it was legalized in England. Neither have the Presbyterian or other Protestant Churches in Great Britain or the United States thought proper to fence the tables against those who have contracted such unions. They endorse, apparently, the dictum of the eminent Quaker John Bright, who once declared that he would 'find it difficult to shout bastard after the offspring of such unions.' In the leading case of Banister *v.* Thompson (1908), where Mr. Banister had married his deceased wife's sister in Canada and was repelled by Canon Thompson, it speedily appeared that the parties were universally respected by their neighbours and that the only persons offended were the Canon and the Bishop, Sheepshanks of Norwich, under whose direction Thompson had acted.

An attempt to enlarge the scope of the rubric was made in the case of Jenkins *v.* Cook (1876), where Jenkins was accused of being 'a depraver of the Book of Common Prayer' by reason of having publicly denied the personality of the devil. Such opinions may at one time have caused offence but do not do so now. Cook was cast, and it appears therefore that though the canon law may still be a guide to what is only generally said in the rubric, it cannot of itself prescribe lawful causes for repelling.

A hypothetical case may perhaps be advanced. Usury is reckoned in Canon 109 along with swearing, drunkenness and unclean living as ground for excommunication, and such persons are not to be admitted to Holy Communion 'till they be reformed.' The practice of usury now no longer gives offence, which perhaps marks a deterioration in the moral sense of Christendom. Bishops no longer preach against usury as Jewel did, and bankers do not 'lend hoping for nothing again.' They take a 'breed of barren metal'—Shylock's crime—and the congregation is not offended. Perhaps it ought to be, but repelling for usury would be a risky venture.

In the Banister case just cited it may be well to recall the

judgment of Lord Loreburn in the House of Lords (June 30, 1912): 'It is inconceivable that any court of law should allow as a lawful cause (*i.e.* for refusing Communion) the cohabitation of two persons whose union is directly sanctioned by Act of Parliament' (Thompson *v.* Dibdin, 1912, A.C. 533). The protracted litigation in this case, which lasted over a period of four years, was entirely due to the fact that Bishop Sheepshanks did not proceed 'according to the canon' as the rubric directs, and which would have given him the decision which the Prayer Book contemplates, but did nothing. Mr. Banister was therefore obliged to seek his remedy elsewhere, and after a preliminary skirmish in the Arches, Canon Thompson, defeated, applied for a writ of prohibition in the King's Bench, then to the Court of Appeal, and at long last to the House of Lords. The Canon must have been ruined by the enormous cost had not this been defrayed by the English Church Union — not one of the Society's happiest efforts. The decision in this case passed without any organized protest on the part of the Church, which must be deemed, therefore, to have conformed its practice to it.

Appearances now indicate that the Church is threatened with another of her 'unhappy divisions.' There are those who, to adopt an older nomenclature, may be styled 'rigorists,' and others 'latitude men.' The logic of the former is unimpeachable. There are no 'innocent parties,' and both the Marriage Service and the Holy Communion are to be refused to all divorced persons whose spouses are still living. This view may seem narrow, but it cannot be ignored. We do not know whether the 'rigorists' would counsel the parties to separate, the father presumably having care of the sons and the mother of the daughters, or whether they would refuse also the Burial Service. The 'latitude men' draw a distinction between the two services — Marriage and the Sacrament—and whilst forbidding the Marriage Service would allow the Sacrament under regulations to be made by the bishops. This has naturally surprised Roman Catholic writers, who cannot understand why the greater sacrament is granted and the lesser refused. We are of opinion that the dichotomy cannot stand. The service for Holy Matrimony provides in the rubric for Communion to follow for those who desire it, and it is difficult to see how it could be refused by the priest, unless

maybe, he should discover that the parties had not been confirmed. We think that the proper direction was given by the late Archbishop Davidson in a letter to his diocese shortly after the passing of the Deceased Wife's Sister Act. His Grace advised against the solemnization of such marriages in church, but stresses that it was only advice and not a formal direction or injunction : 'The law has given a discretion to the incumbent. If, after carefully weighing the whole circumstances, he decides that he ought to perform the marriage . . . I shall in no way regard him as disloyal or disrespectful.' How different is the minatory tone now adopted by some of the bishops who threaten episcopal displeasure or even inhibition. By the Supreme Court of Judicature (Consolidation Act), 1925, 15 & 16 Geo. V, c. 49, § 184.2, it was enacted that 'No clergyman of the Church of England shall be compelled to solemnise the marriage of any person whose former marriage has been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery or shall be liable to any proceedings, penalty or censure for solemnising or refusing to solemnise the marriage of any such person.' The word 'censure' is derived from the canon law, is a term of art, and is clearly intended to safeguard the freedom of the parish priest against the action of his ecclesiastical superiors such as some of their lordships are now attempting to exercise. Happily, since the shock caused to Churchmen by the cession of the late Sir Francis Acland, those threats have at any rate temporarily ceased.

The severer doctrine of marriage now obtaining in High Anglican circles was not taught by the Church at large in pre-Reformation days. For the early Christian Fathers—Augustine, for instance—the ideal marriage was that between Mary and Joseph. A true marriage might exist where there is a mutual vow of chastity, and the sooner this relation was established the better (*De bono conjug.*, 22). The Augustinian rule was presumably found too hard, and presently dispensations and decrees of nullity multiplied, modifying as by an equity jurisdiction the rigour of the general law. The Church of England, too, made her own changes. Formerly marriages between first cousins were forbidden except by dispensation, as also were those in which the parties were connected by 'spiritual affinities,' that is, related through sponsors. Such relations were established between

baptizer and baptized, between god-parents, their god-children and their god-children's relatives. The canon law prior to 1215 forbade all marriages of kinsfolk to the seventh degree, that is, between all who had a common great-great-great-great-great-grandfather. Innocent III in the Lateran Council reduced these prohibitions to extend only to the fourth degree. The Anglican canons of 1603 treat all these old impediments, error, conditio, votum, cognatio, crimen, cultus, disparitus, vis, ordo, . . . si sit affinis (to quote Manzoni) as swept away, doubtless by the Act of Precontracts and Degrees of Consanguinity (32 Hen. VIII., c. 38, 1540), which enacted 'that marriages contracted by persons not prohibited by God's laws and having been solemnised and consummated shall be indissoluble by any pre-contract which has not been consummated. No marriage without the Levitical degrees shall be called in question.' Anne of Cleves was divorced chiefly because of a prior contract with the Marquis of Lorraine, and to this deed two archbishops, seventeen bishops and 139 of the clergy set their hand. Of all this there is no mention in the present canons; for the older regulations Parker's Tables are substituted; that is to say, the framers of the canons altered the marriage laws, and what godly men did once may be done again by godly men who are better informed. It is doubtless best that those who have been divorced and desire to be remarried should normally seek the registry rather than the church; but there may be exceptions when a more merciful interpretation is permissible. In these cases the law leaves the discretion as to the use of the Marriage Service and the administration of the Sacrament to the curate, and wisely so, since he is on the spot and can judge better of all the circumstances than the bishop in a distant palace. It is highly probable that, as in the case of the Deceased Wife's Sister Act, the conscience of the congregation will not be offended by the use of the services of the Church with circumspection in the case of the innocent party, now become more easy to determine, since under the new Marriage Act collusion will be more difficult.

The preface in the Prayer Book 'of Ceremonies' provides the true solution for the present discontents, retaining the interpretative power of the bishops to resolve doubts about the use of the Prayer Book services; 'And if the Bishop of the Diocese

be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.' Some of their lordships are in doubt and a Lambeth 'hearing' is indicated, following the wise decision of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan in 1899 to determine the questions of Reservation and Incense. Here, then, is the 'lawful authority,' not the resolutions of assemblies or convocations.

Meanwhile, it is worthy of note that 'freedom' and 'self-government' for the Church (*i.e.* regulations by bishops) would mean the loss for the individual of his freedom in it.

A. Atkinson.

BOOK REVIEWS

NAZISM AND ROMANISM *

It is sometimes said that there is no religious persecution in Germany, or that the evidence for it is suspect. The only excuse for saying this is ignorance, or the influence of Nazi propaganda. In view of the evidence adduced by Dr. Micklem in his impressive and well-documented volume, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church,* the matter is beyond question. Pope Pius XI was undoubtedly justified when, in his address to the College of Cardinals on Christmas Eve, 1937, he said: 'We must call things by their right names. In Germany there is, in fact, a religious persecution. For long they tried to make us believe that there is no persecution. We know, however, that there is a grievous persecution, and more even, that there has rarely been a persecution so serious, so fearful, so painful and so disastrous in its widespread effects.' If we are inclined to doubt the veracity of the Pope, we may turn to the examples of persecution of Roman Catholics given by Dr. Micklem. It will suffice to quote five of them:

(1) Herr Rosenberg is a high official of the Nazi Party. His function is to prescribe the kind of teaching to be given in the schools and universities and to the Hitler Youth. His book, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century,* contains a philosophy abhorrent to any Roman Catholic and entirely inconsistent with historical Christianity. In April, 1935, Monsignor Leffers was condemned to eighteen months' imprisonment with costs for discussing this book with three students who had come to consult him.

(2) Canon Buchholz was sentenced to three years' imprisonment, and three priests were also sentenced, 'for having acted as "ringleaders" in a riot during a Corpus Christi procession.' The accusation, on the face of it, is false to the point of absurdity.

* *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church.* By Nathaniel Micklem, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (Oxford University Press. 1939. 8/6.)

(3) Herr Pator of Bornheim was sentenced to a year's imprisonment for unfavourable remarks about the Hitler Youth and Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

(4) Fr. Dangelmeier was sent to a Concentration Camp for assembling Catholic youth while Hitler was addressing the nation and for not putting on the loud-speaker until the speech was over.

(5) Fathers Sturm and Lausle were sent to a Concentration Camp for saying Mass for the souls of executed Communists.

That the attitude of the German Government is anti-Christian is shown by a memorandum by the Protestant Army chaplains presented to Herr Hitler at the close of 1937. In the following year there was an Army Purge which, among other things, reduced the influence of the Christian element in the German army. It is doubtful whether such frank criticism would be possible to-day. What the Chaplains have to say is instructive because it comes from German clergymen in a responsible public position. It cannot be dismissed as anti-Nazi propaganda, and it fully bears out the evidence of the prosecutions :

> 'The new breach which divides the German nation,' say the chaplains, 'is the breach between National Socialism and Christianity. . . . The State and the Party combat to-day not only the churches. They combat Christianity. This fact is repeatedly denied. It is true, nevertheless. . . . In the training camps of the Party it is repeatedly explained that National Socialism has three enemies : Judaism, Masonry and Christianity. . . . The State itself is an object of the new ideology that combats the Christian faith. The racial ethic, represented through the Party and the Police, armed with all the forces of the totalitarian State, hurls itself against materially helpless Christianity. . . . Worse than this ruthless use of material and military force is the spiritual violence suffered under State and military discipline. In Halle, a high functionary of the Storm Troops, speaking before assembled members of the organization, referred to Christ as "that swine." Schoolteachers have repeatedly referred to Jesus in their class-rooms as "that Jewish tramp" . . .'

The Nazi apologist takes one of two lines. He either denies that there is any persecution, or he asserts that such persecution as exists is directed against political offenders only and may not properly be described as religious persecution. He will tell you that, if these parsons interfere in political matters, they must expect to suffer the same as anyone else. The denial that there is persecution breaks down on the facts, even if we leave out of account the testimony of the late Pope and the Protestant Army Chaplains. One of the most valuable features of Dr. Micklem's book is that it exposes the hollowness of the contention that the persecution is purely political.

The Roman Catholic Church, because its members belong to many races and countries, has necessarily to adapt itself to very various political sys-

tems. It has no special prejudice against the authoritarian or totalitarian State, regarded purely from the political point of view. In fact its own organization is authoritarian and totalitarian. If the totalitarian State has its censorship, the Roman Catholic Church has its *Index Expurgatorius* of prohibited books. One of the avowed reasons for the establishment of totalitarian régimes is the danger of Communism, and no one detested Communism more than the late Pope. It is therefore not unnatural that Rome should be on good terms with such governments as those of Italy and Japan which claim to be bulwarks against the spread of Communism in Europe and Asia. In Japan the Pope has even gone so far as to allow the participation of Roman Catholics in the cult of the Emperor and of Confucius, though this had been forbidden for two hundred years previously. In Italy he is on friendly terms with the Fascist government. He wished to be on equally good terms with the National Socialist government in Germany, as was shown by the conclusion of a Concordat on July 20, 1933. Even more striking was the reception accorded to the invaders when Austria was annexed last year. Cardinal Innitzer, in fact, acquired the nickname of 'The Heil Hitler Cardinal.' But it was not long before what had happened in Germany was repeated in Austria, though the pace now was much faster. The arrest of priests was begun almost at once, and even a bishop, the Bishop of Salzburg, was temporarily locked in a prison cell 'to protect him from the Communists.'

Why is the Roman Catholic Church persecuted in Germany, in spite of the friendliness it showed to the Government, whereas it is on good terms with the Fascist Government in Italy? The reason is ably expounded in Dr. Micklem's book. Put briefly, it is this. Italy requires the Roman Catholic Church to consent to her politics. The Church is prepared to do this, just as it was prepared to consent to the National Socialist political system. But Italy does not insist that the Church should accept a philosophy of Race and Blood and Soil. Germany does. Hence the persecution. That Rome will go so far to meet the demands of Nationalism in Italy and Japan is proof positive that the quarrel with Germany is not political.

The only terms on which National Socialism will tolerate religion is first that it accepts the philosophy of Blood, Race and Soil, and second, that it concerns itself exclusively with another world and leaves this world to the State. If the Roman Catholic Church had accepted these terms, a glittering prize would have been within its grasp. The Church would have held an honoured position in the most powerful country in the world. 'All this will I give thee, if thou wilt bow down and worship me,' if thou wilt accept the Nazi Revolution as a mighty act of God, and Herr Hitler as one sent by God.

National Socialism is not merely a political system. It is a religion. At first many Christians thought that they could regard it as Christianity

brought up to date and accommodated to the German soul. Events have proved that they were wrong and that Pope Pius XI was right when he described National Socialism as 'a substitute faith that has nothing in common with the faith of the Cross.' It is, of course, also a political system. As such Hitler is its politician and Goebbels its adviser. But, as a religion, or philosophy of life, Rosenberg is its prophet. Rosenberg is a very powerful man in Germany to-day. His interpretation of National Socialism is taught in the schools, in the Hitler Youth organization, and in the universities. In fact no professor, theological or otherwise, can be appointed in any German university without his consent. For an exposition of his philosophy as contained in his *Myth of the Twentieth Century* we must refer our readers to Dr. Micklem's book. We content ourselves here with a statement made by Rosenberg on November 5, 1938, that 'the curriculum of all categories in our schools has already been so far reformed in an anti-Christian and anti-Jewish spirit that the generation which is growing up will be protected from the black swindle.'

The second condition on which National Socialism will tolerate Christianity is that it refrain from interfering with the affairs of this life. Here again, we will content ourselves with a quotation from Herr Rosenberg:

> 'The Churches,' he wrote in a communication to the Confessional Church, 'whether under Catholic, Confessional or German Christian leadership, have essentially only one task—to make known to the people to whom they speak the belief of the Church concerning the life beyond. The earth on which we live has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the Church. With regard to the earth and its affairs National Socialism alone can prescribe for us.'

No loyal Christian, Protestant or Roman Catholic, will accept toleration on these terms. He will rather face, as many have faced, imprisonment or the brutalities of the concentration camp.

It is not easy to get at the truth about the Germany of to-day. 'I can never forget,' writes Dr. Micklem, 'that many friends have risked their lives in trusting me with their confidence.' Just as a pledge of secrecy is exacted from those who are released from concentration camps, so, in many cases, boys, on completion of their period of Labour Service, are compelled to sign an undertaking that they will not reveal the circumstances of their life there. Under such conditions we may indeed say that truth is at the bottom of a well, and that in Germany the well is very deep. But, with the help of lovers of truth such as Dr. Micklem, truth will out. And it is essential that people should face the truth, however ugly it may be. They have now no excuse for refusing to do so. National Socialism has been fully revealed as what it is, a philosophy or religion or world-outlook utterly inconsistent with anything that can rightly be called Christian.

G. L. H. Harvey.

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE OF IMMORTALITY*

Vigilemus et oremus. The fact that Professor A. E. Taylor's most lucid little volume concludes with this admonition indicates that he approaches with no mere academic interest and no uncertain faith the doctrine of eternal life, which is, perhaps, together with the Christian belief in the meaning of history, the subject of most vital interest in this uncertain age of tottering ideals and ruthless persecutions. As the author says:

> 'The question is whether the very foundations of the Christian view of life are tenable, and in dealing with such a question we manifestly cannot take one part of the Christian scheme for granted to prove another.'
>
> 'Christianity — that is, if it is what it professes to be — is really a revelation and disclosure of God's purposes for us, made from the side of God Himself, and, at the same time, the God to whom it bears witness is no other than the God to whom the careful and unbiased use of our intelligence has been directing us. It is a faith, but no less certainly, rightly apprehended, a reasonable faith.'

We are then promised a survey of the problem from first principles.

The author begins with the important distinction between 'the hope of immortality' and 'the prospect of survival after death,' and remarks that there is nothing inspiring in the thought of mere indefinite existence, whereas the hope of eternal life is the mainspring of all high religion and noble moral living, since it is 'the quality of the life for which a man believes himself to be made' which matters. Homer's wraiths, typical of widespread primitive belief in survival, are but pale shadows of earthly men, whose frail existence could only make men cling the more to the fuller joys of earth; and primitive Old Testament beliefs led to the same conclusion, because Yahweh is a 'God not of the dead but of the living' and religion ceases among the dead. Christianity, however, takes the opposite view. It affirms that this life is but the 'porch' to the next, and that in this life we have the opportunity of inheriting the next by attaining 'a new quality' of life, 'with new interests and purposes,' and that this new life is 'a gift of God.' The specifically Christian view of immortality is therefore dependent on 'the character of the Giver.'

For this there had been a twofold preparation. Among the Israelites in late pre-Christian days there grew up a belief in the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked, and this resurrection was a reanimation of the whole man, soul and body, effected directly by God, whose desire is to reward the righteous and to punish the wicked. It is a faith based on the nature of God, but the life of the resurrected may be very crudely materialistic. Plato, on the other hand, corrects this and stresses the fact that the centre of the interest of the new life is in truth, goodness and beauty, to which the eye of the soul must be turned from the images of the material

* *The Christian Hope of Immortality.* By A. E. Taylor, LL.D. (John Heritage, Christian Challenge Series. 3/6. 1938.)

world. But Plato is only interested in the soul, to which the body is an encumbrance and almost an enemy. Therefore he fails to realize the true nature of personality and tends to regard the soul as immortal in its own right if only it can be freed from the body; consequently Plato regards the immortality of the soul as independent of the character of a personal God.

Christianity combined 'the thoughts of the newer and higher quality of "immortal" life, and those of God as its only source and guarantee, and of the preservation of the whole man . . . unto everlasting life.' The question is whether the Christian belief is coherent and tenable in the light of modern knowledge

Professor Taylor shows that the fact that after earthly death life becomes imperceptible to us is no proof that that life has become non-existent. Next he shows the inconclusive nature of the three usual types of argument for immortality—the empirical, ethical and metaphysical. He makes a new beginning from the consideration of the nature of personality:

> 'What does it mean to be alive as a self at all?'
>
> 'The very possibility of the simplest experience is . . . dependent on a mysterious act of identification, an identification of one of the "things observed" as in some way the same thing with that which "finds" all these things there without being one of them,'

and every self has a

> 'strictly incommunicable and hidden existence of its own as the subject of its experiences—that which has them all, but is itself none of them,'

and its complete existence and nature can never be known by another self.

To die, then, must be to 'cease to be a subject experiencing anything,' and 'to experience dying should mean to experience the transition from having experiences to having none.' But 'to experience the total absence of having experience' is an impossibility. Both birth and death must be as incapable of being experienced as of being observed. Such experience and observation are logically impossible, and awareness cannot have arisen from anything totally lacking it.

But a human self is 'a personal self,' and Professor Taylor adopts Boethius' definition of a person—'an individual substance of rational nature'—and points out that to be a person is not merely to possess one's own being, but to know that one possesses it, and so to be able to say 'I am' or 'I do' with full understanding of its meaning. Such a self conscious person also expects to be able to find an explanation of events around him, an 'intelligible pattern' in them just as in his own actions. Moreover intelligent personality is gradually achieved as we

> 'bring more and more steady conscious purpose into the control of our actions, and discover more and more of coherent pattern in the sequence of events around us.'

In fact,

> 'to be a full and complete person would be at once to have a plan and purpose in one's own life subject to no interior vacillation or disturb-

ance and to understand the whole world in a way which left nothing in it baffling and unintelligible. To such a being defeat and death would have lost all its meaning; his life would be a strictly eternal one.'

Dr. Taylor concludes that personality cannot be reduced to anything else but must be derived from primitive and unoriginated personality to which everything is intelligible. Therefore the whole world must be His creation and 'an expression of His intelligence,' intelligible through and through because its Author is 'pure and perfect intelligence.' Therefore there must be meaning in the history of the universe, and it will have an intelligible moral purpose which will treat a person as having 'the moral value which morality declares to be in him.' The world is a 'vale of soul-making.'

Professor Taylor next proceeds to show that the specific assertions of Christianity about immortality agree with what a dispassionate examination of personality and the world would lead us to expect. Christianity is held to agree with the anticipations of independent reason, but to have given 'a new and determinate character to these anticipations,' and so is rightly a 'revelation.' This historic revelation is seen in the Incarnation and Crucifixion of our Lord — 'historic events' which were 'witnesses to the self-forgetting love . . . of the very Lord of Creation Himself.' This witness of revelation made it possible in future for life to be 'inspired by a supreme, grateful love, not simply to a great human benefactor but to the Maker,' and made it impossible to regard the world as hostile or indifferent, in which case high morality could only have the courage of despair.

The reader will find this chapter very interesting in view of current doctrines of political 'realism' and subjective theories of value, and he will appreciate the final chapters which deal most fairly with the nature of the society of souls which know even as they are known and with the basic truths behind the doctrines of Hell and Judgment.

The whole book is a very helpful and constructive attempt to show how the essential truths of Christianity agree with and clarify the best modern thought. It is an attempt to stabilize once more human life and history by basing them on Christian and moral ideals.

W. Richardson.

RUDOLPH OTTO AND THE GOSPELS*

Lutheranism, it is well known, tends to make a very radical distinction between the religious and the natural spheres of experience. Whether the 'Natural' Orders are to be slavishly obeyed and accepted, or whether they are to be ascetically disregarded, Lutherans would agree that the real hall-mark of religion is a mysticism which is in the last resort utterly unlike any other experience. Thus in his much-read book *The Idea of the Holy,* Professor Otto admitted indeed that the 'numinous' element in religious

* *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man.* By Rudolph Otto. Translated by F. V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. (Lutterworth Press. 1938. 15/-.)

experience is closely analogous to the ' sublime ' in aesthetic experience, but insisted that it can never be analysed in terms of it. The Holy is *sui generis,* ' wholly other '—in fact a fourth absolute value to be placed alongside the familiar three.

Thus it is through the spectacles of a highly critical, scholarly and liberal Lutheran that this fascinating volume invites us to look once again at the Gospels. Professor Otto's liberalism limits his Lutheranism, but the reverse process is even more apparent, and it is seldom possible for a liberal Anglican to forget that it is a Lutheran who is writing. And in *this* case denominational differences are still real. Our author takes a very liberal, and convincing, line when he traces back much of our Lord's eschatological conception of the Kingdom of God triumphing over that of Satan not to the Old Testament, but to Zoroaster; but he is no less typically Lutheran when he insists that the Kingdom has nothing in common with this world, that it is ' *wholly* other ' (p. 33) and awakens ' numinous apperception ' (p. 41). That there is no real evidence for this interpretation in the Gospels he admits himself (p. 48):

> ' The images which Jesus uses for it, the naïve pre-suppositions which he makes regarding it, even the suggestions that we shall be " as the angels," or that heaven and earth shall pass away, do not express it fully.'

It is in two citations from St. Paul that he finds ' for the first time more adequate expressions of the eschatological order.' One is reminded of Luther's saying that St. Paul's Epistles were to him ' more of a gospel than Matthew, Mark, or Luke.' But surely, however much one may doubt the authenticity of certain passages, to interpret Jesus in the light of what St. Paul says rather than from the evidence of the Gospels is to make His words ' a subject of abitrary interpretations made . . . according to the fancy of the interpreter,' which we are rightly warned against on p. 43. As it is, our author finds ' the peculiar irrationality which essentially inheres in a genuine eschatology ' in the Gospels by an uncritical acceptance of all the apocalyptic teaching attributed to Jesus as genuine. He positively revels in the inconsistencies of Mark xiii. And in this context his love for ' numinous ' irrationality has apparently made him forget the principle enunciated on p. 334, and to which he is often true, that the ' particular criterion for what actually happens ' is ' self-consistency of personality.'

But few people would deny in these days that he is entirely right to stress the eschatological teaching of our Lord. It is the interpretation of the eschatology which is in question. Otto stops far short of the extremer absurdities of Schweitzer, and there is much that is of very great value in the book.

It is not easy to summarise the main argument, because it is involved and at times tortuous, and the style is often vague and paradoxical. But the

fundamental points are that genuine eschatology must include (*a*) the note of a 'wondrous new creation' ('other,' we can agree, but not '*wholly* other'), and (*b*) the ideal of its *real* coming, and consequent urgent call to repentance. Further, the kingdom is a 'realm of royal sovereignty' which comes down from above, but into which individuals can enter, and which contains the heavenly Son of Man, his throne, the angels of God, Abraham's bosom, etc., and the children of the Kingdom. It is opposed to the realm of Satan (as in Zoroaster, but not in the Old Testament) and its righteousness is better than that of the Pharisees. It is 'God's seed, not man's deed,' (the parables most stressed are the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, the Net, and the Sower). The whole conception is derived largely from Zoroastrianism, and is far more other-worldly than anything in the Old Testament (where the term *malkuth* is only used of present, not future, kingship, and is therefore not eschatological; only in the Book of Daniel does the latter conception first appear). The eschatology of Jesus is also far more positive than the teaching of John the Baptist, who, despite the words wrongly attributed to him in *Mt.* iii, 2, 'only preached the coming judgment of wrath.' For Otto follows Goguel in supposing that the breach between Jesus and the Baptist was great (pp. 69-78).

As to the time of its coming, it was already dawning, already 'exercising its power' (for so *βιάζεται* in *Mt.* xi, 12, is convincingly re-translated). It was 'so near that one is tempted to translate: It is present.' But it had not actually come with Jesus. Unlike Professor C. H. Dodd, who was in point of fact stimulated above all by this book to coin the phrase 'realised eschatology,' Otto insists that the view that the Kingdom had actually come with Him is not part of the original teaching of Jesus, but is a modification introduced by the early Church, which thus lost the sense of the imminence of the Kingdom in its belief that it was itself the Kingdom, which had come fully at Pentecost: 'the idea of the *regnum Christi* as already present displaced that of the *regnum Dei* as already dawning. The experience of the Kingdom was explained as the experience of the spirit' (p. 150). But really 'the kingdom of heaven was not already, here and now, *his* kingdom. Only later would he inherit it. . . . God was to establish it for him on the basis of his obedient suffering of death' (p. 151). Again 'it is not Jesus who brings the kingdom . . . on the contrary the kingdom brings him with it. Moreover, it was not he but rather God himself who achieved the first great divine victory over Satan.' He *beheld* Satan fall from heaven like lightning.

What then was Jesus' view of His own person? Wrede's denial of His Messianic consciousness 'does violence to the sources.' 'The Church did not produce, but was produced by, that Messianic faith.' Even the sayings and doings of Jesus which do not have a definite Messianic form 'testify to a definite and particular consciousness of mission' (see pp. 162-173);

and to one who was conscious of such a mission the concrete historical form of this consciousness 'could be no other than that of a Messiah, and determined in particular by the idea of the apocalyptic figure of the Son of Man.'

And so we pass to the Book of Enoch, especially Chapters 37-71, that late portion usually referred to as the 'Similitudes' or 'Parables,' which speak of a transcendent Son of Man, the 'elect one dwelling under the wings of the Lord of Spirits' (a Persian term for God; the spirits are *fravashis,* the spiritual 'doubles' of men such as the 'angel' of Peter for whom Rhoda mistook him in *Acts* xii, 13 (*cf. Mt.* xviii, 10). The Book of Enoch also refers to God as 'Him who had an aged head, and His head was white like wool,' which is a conception far less like that of Yahweh, the youthful warrior, than of Zorvan, the post-Zoroastrian God of eternity). The Son of Man 'who has righteousness . . . and who reveals all the treasures of what is hidden' is eventually declared to be the actual Son of the Lord of Spirits. Thus the Deity Himself has become too remote and majestic to interfere in this world, and retires behind a mediator who is to effect a transformation of this world and, after the defeat of the Evil One, act as its judge. And according to Otto (but not R. H. Charles), Enoch himself is finally identified with the Son of Man (lxxi, 14, p. 208). And hence arose the idea

> 'that a powerful preacher alike of righteousness, the coming judgment, and the blessed new age, a prophet of the eschatological Son of Man, would be transported at the end of his earthly career to God; that he would be exalted to become the one whom he had proclaimed' (p. 213).

Such, we are to suppose, was the ideal which Jesus inherited and gradually applied to Himself.

> 'He did not contemplate a bodily revivication and resurrection after his death, but that he would depart and be exalted like Enoch, and, from the time when he recognised that the Son of Man must suffer, he thought of death itself as a gateway to exaltation.

There is much (and of course much that we have here omitted) which is suggestive in Otto's analysis; but one is tempted to ask whether such a Messiah would ever have got as far as dying the death reserved by the Romans for slaves and rebels. Surely the wholly other-worldliness of Enoch is not the sort of thing which harassed administrators, from Pilate to Hitler, will condemn? It is not enough to say that 'one who claimed to be ruler of the world had to be nailed to the cross by the Roman magistrates' (p. 58)—for one thing it is extremely doubtful whether Jesus did claim to be ruler of the world before Pilate; indeed it is significant that Otto supposes that Jesus expected, even at the Last Supper, not to be crucified, but stoned—by the Jews. For our part, we cannot believe that Jesus, any more than

Niemöller, was so exclusively occupied with wholly other-worldly speculations. His disciples were to pray that God's will be done *on earth* as it is in Heaven; and we prefer to believe, more on the lines of Professor Dodd, that the Kingdom did come down to earth during the lifetime of Jesus, and above all through his self-sacrificial death. Otto does indeed link up his transcendent Son of Man with the conception of the Suffering Servant, and even forces the Greek word λύτρον into the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, but one feels all the time that his stress upon the other-worldly future exaltation of the Enochian Son of Man takes away much of the heart from the Christian gospel. He seems to us to build far too much upon the 'Similitudes of Enoch.' It is true that they contain certain close resemblances to the New Testament (*cf.* pp. 382-7, where, however, most of the parallels are taken not from the Similitudes but from the still later Slavonic (II) Enoch), but the same is true of *e.g.* the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Again, the date of the Similitudes is very uncertain, and scholars like Schürer and Dodd would place them in the first century A.D., in which case they might have influenced the Evangelists, but scarcely Jesus Himself.

But, while we cannot accept his main thesis about the Son of Man, we cannot be other than extremely grateful for the scholarship, the imagination, and the noble spirituality of this book. We would particularly commend the section on the 'Charismatic type' towards the end, which contains a discussion of miracles which is lifted far above the commonplaces of the naïve fundamentalist and the naïve rationalist, and where literary criticism of a high order is most fruitfully combined with more general considerations drawn from our author's contacts with psychologists and other scientists, and his wide knowledge of comparative religion. The translation is at times too literal, but is generally scholarly and accurate, and there are but few misprints.

H. P. Kingdon.

TWO COMMENTARIES AND A STUDY *

It is not easy even nowadays to find a commentary on any book or books of the Bible which may be put into the hands of a layman with confidence in both its scholarship and immediate attractiveness. Most fall between these stools, though many contain at least some of the information which it is desirable that modern readers should have. The Rev. N. R. Campbell's *A Layman's Commentary on the Gospels* is of this class: it is a welcome change from the old type of traditionalist commentary, but it seeks to bend new knowledge too often to the service of the old ideas, instead of leading

**A Layman's Commentary on the Gospels* By N. R. Campbell. (Skeffington. 6/-. 1937.)

The Gospel According to St. Luke. A Commentary. By J. A. Findlay, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 3/6. 1937.)

The Epistle to the Hebrews. By V. Burch, D.D. (Williams & Norgate. 5/-. 1936.)

the reader boldly (as Bishop Gore did so splendidly in his earlier days) to see clearly what was the glory of the new knowledge, a fuller understanding of the character of the Bible and of Christ. This task is far better discharged by Prof. J. A. Findlay in *The Gospel according to St. Luke,* a book which has the advantage of including the RV text of the Gospel; the notes being added after each chapter, an arrangement making for easy reading, and better enjoyment of the light thrown on the text by the admirably fresh and originally presented notes. Prof. Findlay does not try to explain away difficulties in order to lull the doubts of the faithful, but rather to provoke believer and enquirer alike to think for themselves. This book can be thoroughly recommended for the purpose for which it was written, as a text book for schools and colleges, and it would also provide an excellent way for an enquiring layman to re-read St. Luke. It is a companion volume to the author's *The Acts of the Apostles.*

Dr. V. Burch's *The Epistle to the Hebrews* is not a commentary but a study. Its chief drawback is its extraordinarily allusive and obscure style, abounding in metaphor sometimes very difficult to understand, thus giving the impression that it is a book which would be read with great interest and enjoyment by a competent scholar already familiar with much of what is contained in it but not with the presentation and unusual views of Dr. Burch. The author rejects any theory of Hellenistic, particularly of Alexandrine ancestry for the Epistle, and finds the secret of its structure in the Synagogue Lectionary and its *raison d'être* in the appeal to the Semite race-mind of a conception of their journey's end as the establishment of a full relationship through Jesus Christ to God, taking the place of safe-dwelling in the holy city (the now destroyed Jerusalem); an appeal to minds 'in exile' and knowing the lure at this crisis in their history back to the 'lowland ways' from which it had been the prophets' task ever to recall them, but from which man can never be finally reclaimed except by the revelation of Jesus Christ. This book shows through its obscurity consummate skill in argument and real profundity, which deep appreciation of the Epistle has inspired; and though we may sigh for greater clarity, the reader is more than repaid for his trouble by being made acquainted with a highly original study of the Epistle which has the outstanding merit of inclusiveness: every item in its structure, instead of being merely dismantled and analysed, is shown to have its necessary and significant place in the whole. The result is to remind us forcibly that there is reason for regarding the *Epistle to the Hebrews* as among the most profound and moving books in the New Testament, and to show why it had such a character for the people for whom it was written.

A. R. C. Leaney.

SPIRITUAL THERAPEUTICS*

Now that both the educated and the uneducated public no longer take seriously the claims of the clergy to supernatural powers and functions, probably the most useful ambition a cleric can entertain is to equip himself to be a comparatively efficient physician of souls. Most parochial clergymen in the course of their work glean sufficient knowledge to make them empirical practitioners of varying competence, but a good many are handicapped by lack of the scientific outlook and training, and also by prejudices associated with theological views of human nature. Dr. Grensted is well equipped to serve as a guide to those clergy who entertain this laudable ambition of being able 'to minister to the good of souls,' though the work under review is of a popular character and suited rather for the patient than for the practitioner. An impression of the good quality of the book may be gained from one or two quotations:

> '"Things in themselves" are shadowy and unsubstantial, if, indeed, the phrase has any meaning at all. Ideas, apart from the persons who hold them, are even more shadowy, despite the immense part they have played in history. It is sometimes hard to remember that no idea is of any worth or force apart from the men and women through whose lives it acts. . . .
>
> 'It matters exceedingly that we should not be taken in by this business of what are sometimes called "ideologies." Theories as to the right ordering of human life are a necessary part of our political and social thinking and planning. But they have a dangerous habit of trying to live a life of their own, separated from their true context in the individual, with the not unnatural result that they have frequently, as history shows, turned destroyer, consuming in the name of an ideal the very persons in whose interests the ideal was conceived.

Does not this fatal tendency of the doctrinaire idealist display itself conspicuously in the dogmatic theologian, whose interest centres primarily in unprovable dogmas, and only secondarily in concrete personalities? Do not the creeds 'live a life of their own'?—if we are to call it a life. And has not a creed often 'turned destroyer' of all spontaneity and creativeness in religion?

Again:

> 'The way to victory in this battle is not by striving, but by peace. It is a well known psychological principle that effort defeats its own ends, since it concentrates attention upon the struggle and not upon that which lies beyond the struggle. . . .
>
> 'We find relaxation, then, when we turn outwards from ourselves, so that the strain is withdrawn from the inner conflict. That is why we begin to have the sense of peace when we talk to somebody who stands outside the struggle.'

And again:

> 'Anxiety is a very troublesome condition indeed, and one to be taken seriously. And there are many circumstances in life which are

* *This Business of Living.* By L. W. Grensted, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 5/-. 1938.)

tragic, and overmastering in their threat to our peace of body and mind. But when such problems arise, and anxiety with them, we shall normally do more by dealing with the anxiety than with the problem. If we can recognize its true character and be rid of it, we shall be free to do the right thing, whatever it is, about the problem.'

Dr. Grensted has written a very useful and encouraging book, which should prove very helpful to a large number of people. J.C.H.

AN EYE OPENER *

This beautiful book contains a short introduction by the Warden of Bembridge School to the collection of drawings by John Ruskin which are in the gallery of the school. This is followed by some sixty-seven illustrations selected from the drawings, together with short and interesting notes upon every picture in the collection, including those not illustrated in the book. The book is a work of art in every way and should be in the possession of all who love the English Watercolourists, containing as it does illustrations of a good deal of little-known material.

Those who tend to think of Ruskin primarily as a writer will profit by the study of his drawings and illustrations. These display a delicacy of touch and in many instances a loving appreciation of detail in nature such as can only be found elsewhere in Dürer's studies of animals and plants. In architectural detail Ruskin is the pupil of Prout, while his landscape shows the influence of Turner whom he so much revered . . . a most catholic combination of qualities, and sufficient to place him in the front rank of English Watercolourists. But it is less Ruskin's object to shine as a virtuoso than to provide with his own good craftsmanship illustrations of the good craftsmanship of others.

The introduction serves a twofold purpose—to draw attention to an aspect of Ruskin's genius which has been overlooked, and to discourse upon the value of drawing as a part of education, mention incidentally being made of the rôle which that branch of art fills in the life of Bembridge School. The book is therefore also one for those who are concerned with education.

The main object of such a collection in a school is, of course, to inspire the young with the love of beautiful works. ' It is not an exaggeration to say that a boy who becomes interested in a single great picture ' (or in superb studies of one such as Ruskin made, we might add) ' has received a permanent key by which he can unlock further rooms in the mansion of art. He learns, too, not to be frightened of pictures.'

The reviewer can bear that out from personal experience, since the memory of the day when he was first confronted with a Great Master and

* *Ruskin the Painter and His Works at Bembridge.* By J. Howard Whitehouse. (Oxford University Press. 16/- net. 1938.)

had his eyes opened to the *nuances* of a new medium of expression, by the kindly offices of a loved schoolmaster, is still fresh in his mind. Nothing is more to be desired in the outfit of the modern clergyman than that he should have his eyes opened artistically. One can think of many cases where excellent ability and goodwill fail to attract because of a lack of a sense of beauty in word, music, or decoration. Indeed, it is not improbable that a considerable percentage of the falling off of church attendance is due to the fact that the clergy have been far outstripped in artistic appreciation by their flocks. A generation which has been brought up to expect the beautiful colours and clean lines of many of our modern places of assembly, will distrust and find themselves little attracted by the fussiness of much of our church ritual and art—defects which Ruskin had he been alive to-day would surely have castigated.

If the parson's eyes have not been opened to the message of the prophets in the realm of art, he cannot expect to show to others what he himself has not seen. It is the merit of this book that like Ruskin himself it is an eyeopener.

J. D. Pearce-Higgins.

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM STUART MACGOWAN

The Modern Churchmen's Union has lost a very old member by the death of the Rev. Dr. W. S. Macgowan, a former member of its Council and a contributor to the *Modern Churchman*. The following obituary notice appeared in *The Times* of July 8, 1939:—

The Rev. Dr. W. S. Macgowan, vicar of the united benefices of Holy Trinity, Kingsway, and St. John's, Drury Lane, W.C., who lived at Middleton Road, Golders Green, died on Thursday.

William Stuart Macgowan, who was born in 1864, was the eldest son of the late A. T. Macgowan, M.D., of Bristol. He was educated at Bristol Grammar School, and on the Continent, thereby laying the foundation for his mastery of modern languages. He went to King's College, Cambridge, as a Choral Scholar, and to the time of his death he possessed a fine bass voice and was a competent musician. He graduated with honours in Modern Languages and Law, and later took the degree of LL.D. His first appointment was as an assistant master at Cheltenham in 1888, and in 1896 he became a house master. Originally intended for the Diplomatic Service, his love of teaching led him to take orders in the Church of England, and in 1897 he became chaplain at Cheltenham. In 1902 he was appointed Principal of St. Andrew's College, Grahamstown, South Africa, which position he held until 1909. Various appointments followed at home, and of these he would often recall the happy years spent as lecturer at St. Anne's, Soho. At that church his powerful preaching drew large congregations, for as an orator he excelled. Public recognition of his talents was afforded by his

appointment in 1931 as Golden Lecturer. From 1919 he was appointed incumbent of Holy Trinity, Kingsway, and during a vicariate of twenty years he did much to beautify the church and to better the lot of his parishioners. Other positions he had held were those of member of the Council of the University of the Cape of Good Hope; member of the Rhodes University College Council; examiner in languages to several universities and for the Civil Service; chairman of the Modern Language Association, 1913 to 1916 and in 1920; and chairman of the Education Committee of the Institut Français de Royaume Uni. He was a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour. A keen Freemason, he reached the rank of Grand Chaplain, and he was ever to the fore in acts of philanthropy.

Dr. Macgowan was a scholar, not only in his own domain of languages, but also in the study of philosophy. A friendship with Rudolf Eucken was one of his most treasured memories. He was beloved of his people, for he was a true friend to those in trouble, a lover of little children and of young people. His memory will long be hallowed among the people of Holborn as a cheerful Christian gentleman who found the secret of happiness in making many happy. In 1889 he married, Inez, second daughter of Mr. G. A. Passingham, of the Grange, Heston. She died in 1936. They had three sons and a daughter. He married secondly, in 1937, Emily Amelia, second daughter of the late Mr. John Coles, of Kensington Park Gardens, W.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

CREMATION AND THE CREEDS.

Sir,

As a Modernist layman, I have read with interest the Editor's notes on 'Cremation and the Creeds' (*M.C.*, p. 122). I have no training as a theologian, but Resurrection, I take it, means 'rising again.' When and in what manner do we rise again, and what is it exactly that will rise? The average Christian believes that at death we immediately commence another state of being, the conditions and period of which are unknown to us. The 'Resurrection of the Body,' or 'of the Dead,' are phrases which to me are meaningless. The whole thought of the Church on this difficult doctrine at present appears to be confused and uncertain.

Underhill, Shawford, Winchester. F. E. Abbott.
June 30th, 1939.

[Our correspondent's criticism of the confusion and contradiction in the Church's teaching concerning the Resurrection of the Dead is well-founded. Traditionalist Churchmen hold that the human body which goes into the grave at burial will rise from it at the Last Day. Modernist Churchmen hold that nothing of the sort will take place and that the human personality has at death shed its physical integument for ever.

Certainly the word Resurrection in the original Latin does mean rising again, and was for many ages applied to the rising of the body from the grave. Thomas Hood in his *Whims and Oddities* depicts, in a rough sketch, body-snatchers exhuming a corpse from a grave at the head of which stands a tomb-stone on which the word *resurgam* appears in large capitals. In the Greek original the two words used for Resurrection are not so precise in their meaning. They may mean getting up after sleep, or standing up from a sitting or recumbent posture. The words of Jesus to the daughter of Jairus, *Talitha Kumi,* 'Little girl, get up,' words which her Mother might have addressed to her when calling her in the morning, is rendered by one of the Greek words for Resurrection. In some passages of his Epistles, St. Paul uses the word Resurrection in a spiritual sense, of the Christian rising to a higher moral and spiritual life: 'If ye then be risen with Christ seek those things which are above.'

In the light of this wider and more flexible use of the term Resurrection in the New Testament, there seems to us no objection to retaining the phrase which has been used for so many Christian ages, provided it be in the form Resurrection of the Dead, not Resurrection of the Body or Resurrection of the Flesh.—Ed., *M.C.*]

BROWNING AND MODERN THOUGHT.

Sir,

There is a point in Mr. Leaney's interesting review of my book, *Browning and Modern Thought,* which raises a vital issue. He says:—

> 'Miss Kenmare rightly emphasises the importance of the attraction of many present-day intellectuals towards Christianity and of the successful return to the stage of religious drama . . . but when she sees in these happenings signs that "the Christian revolution may yet come in time to save civilisation" we are bound to shake our heads.'

Now I contend that at the present time there is for every Christian the most pressing need to maintain a constructive, even optimistic, attitude to the prolonged 'crisis' through which we appear to be passing. 'Defeatism' is all too prevalent, and is one of the most alarming evidences of the evil power of propaganda, which has been insidiously creeping into men's minds for some years. (I believe the sense of crisis itself has been created by propaganda.)

If we believe that 'with God all things are possible,' we *must* affirm that 'the Christian revolution may—indeed, *can*—come in time to save civilisation.' The very extremity of our need may well be the earnest of our salvation. Surely there has never been a time when so many men—*not only avowed Christians*—have come to believe that only Christianity *can* save the world from disaster. And 'the attraction of many present-day intellectuals' is a profoundly significant factor. Such writers as T. S. Eliot and Aldous Huxley, for example, influence the thinking of thousands, possibly millions: therefore their 'attraction towards Christianity' is of world-wide importance (Huxley, certainly, is read in many countries other than England).

Dallas Kenmare.

169 Fountain Court, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W.1.
July 4th, 1939.

THE RELIABILITY OF THE RECORD OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

SIR,

Canon Bezzant's article, 'History in the Gospels,' in your June number prompts me to make the following observations.

One sometimes hears the remark from someone whose acquaintance with the work of Biblical criticism is superficial, 'We cannot know what Jesus said, because there are so many interpolations and because He never wrote anything.'

The points which are not sufficiently considered are these: (1) It is likely that Jesus repeated His teaching again and again in the hearing of His disciples in nearly, or quite, the same words. A great teacher realises what is of paramount importance to give to his hearers. His aim is to impart, not novelties, but vital truths. Vital truth must be repeated frequently if it is to be effective. It was said of Him, 'Never man spake as this Man.' That did not mean that he said something quite new, but that His personality gave a new significance to the truth He uttered. We are told that He went from village to village proclaiming His message, and it was the same message He had to proclaim in each spot.

(2) It is pointed out in a valuable little book, 'The Gospel before the Gospels,' that much of the teaching in the Synoptics is couched in rhythmic language—a careful reader can verify this for himself. Almost the whole of the sermon on the Mount had this character. The author of the above mentioned book suggests that the teaching was probably delivered in this style so that it might be more easily remembered. The disciples would thus learn the words by heart without trying to commit them to memory.

(3) When we remember that memory was much stronger in those days, when to read and write was only the accomplishment of the better educated classes, we realise that the disciples who accompanied Jesus in His travels up and down the country would find His teaching indelibly impressed on their minds, and often also His actual words.

When he passed out of sight these precious memories would be repeated often and written down by those who could thus record them. They would be taught to new disciples and to those sent out to teach. Therefore it seems to me entirely unnecessary to assume that the Gospels do not preserve for us, not only the main teaching, but also to a great extent the very words in which it was repeatedly given. In some of the chapters in the Fourth Gospel (notably v—viii) we recognise disjointed fragments, and we feel that many expressions convey rather the impression of what His hearers understood than the words He exactly used. But Lord Charnwood has pointed out in his work on this Gospel that it is probable that the discourses on the last evening before His Passion are fairly accurately remembered. These last words would be specially impressive and would be cherished in the memory of the disciple whom Jesus loved.

A student can trace two lines of memory in Chapters xiii—xiv inclusive and xv—xvi. The recorder seems to have first transcribed his memories in Chapters xiii, xiv, and then, later, gone over the same ground recalling other words that had been said on the subject referred to in xiii, xiv. These later expansions of the theme we find in xv, xvi.

Perhaps these suggestions, though not new, may be of interest to some readers of this Journal.

HELEN A. DALLAS.

Bellevue, Hurstpierpoint.

HOLIDAY CONFERENCE AT OLDFELD SCHOOL, SWANAGE, SEPTEMBER 4TH TO 11TH, 1939.

SIR,

The Union is branching out into a new activity this year, and I should be grateful if you would kindly allow me to draw the attention of your readers to it. During the week following the Girton Conference we are having a Holiday Conference at Swanage in Dorset. This is meant for young people, and ample opportunities for free time will be allowed.

The speakers are drawn from the younger members of the Union, and much of the time during meetings will be allotted to discussion. The morning subjects are: 'God Speaks,' (1) 'In the Bible,' (2) 'In the Natural World,' (3) 'In the Life of the Church,' (4) 'In Personal Experience.' The evening subjects are the Christian attitude to War, Sex, Worship and the Common Life. The scope has been made very wide so as to provide some interest for everybody.

We should be glad if your readers would kindly draw the attention of the young people (18 to 30) of their acquaintance to this Conference and invite them to come. The cost of the week is 30/-, and programmes can be obtained from me; applications should be sent to me.

T. J. WOOD
(*Organizing Secretary*).

520 Grand Buildings,
Trafalgar Square,
London, W.C.2.
July 6th, 1939.

BISHOP HENSON AND HUMAN NATURE.

SIR,

I must thank Dr. Bradford for his comment on my letter. I am fully aware of the orthodox belief in man as 'separate from God and possessing the godlike attribute of free-will.' What I still maintain, however, is that those who *deny* that man has the 'godlike attribute of free-will' appear to display more of the true spirit of Christianity towards their fellows than those who assert it. The former know that the only *rôle* possible for them is that of saviour, and not judge, of mankind. (For an interesting modern elaboration of this theme see Viscount Samuel's *Belief and Action.*)

I could hardly wish for an apter illustration of my point than this sentence from Bishop Henson's sermon on p. 126 of the June issue: 'History is seen to be the arena of Divine activity, and *men are drawn into an eternal conflict as the allies or opponents of their Creator.*' That is the view engendered by the orthodox belief in man's freedom, and a truly terrible one, to my mind, it is. Where, in the Bishop's dark vision of men in 'eternal conflict,' is to be seen one ray of the gospel of love, of forgiveness, of 'the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man'? This 'absolutising' of law, moral or ceremonial, with its necessary implication of men divided into camps as allies or opponents of God, has formed a sanction or a stimulus for every form of persecution and intolerance which defiles the history of the Church. There can be no more compelling motive of hatred and vengeance than the belief that one's opponents are also the opponents of God. The best men have, by reason of their very godliness, been led to do the most barbarous of deeds in the conviction that they were fighting in God's cause. 'Philip II and Isabella the Catholic,' wrote Lecky, 'inflicted more suffering in obedience to their consciences than Nero and Domitian in obedience to their lusts.'

Surely the movement of Divine revelation is always in the direction of some form of universalism and away from the idea of God as 'taking sides.' The conception of God as universal Cause, to which I personally am attracted, is only, after all, a more exact rendering of the Christian conception of God as universal Father. That God does not take the side even of the righteous seems to me to be the truth revealed in the life and death and teaching of Jesus. Yet the eternal attractiveness of that life and death, and the deathlessness of that teaching, seem to prove that, after all, God does take sides. History reveals the paradox that God takes the side of those who, in their humility, refuse to believe that He does take sides. The future, as Jesus foretold, is with the meek.

EDWIN V. MILNER.

School House, Brayton, nr. Selby, Yorkshire.
20th June, 1939.

SIR,

Bishop Henson stated in his sermon on May 17th that 'Christianity is indestructible because it is rooted in the very nature of man.' This to me is such an absolutely new and contrary idea to the whole spiritual teaching of the Bible, especially by Christ and the Apostle Paul, that for us Modern Churchmen to accept it in silence seems to be wrong, for the confusion of thought must be terribly increased by such statements.

The whole scheme of God's plan of salvation, as we know it, is that mankind in the natural state was and is anti-Christian and needs a spiritual graft into righteousness; that the nature of man is sinful—that is, selfish in all forms of self-centredness—yet so created that by a will towards something higher than himself he can slough off this evil nature and be renewed, transformed, enlightened, redeemed by the Power outside himself—which is the Spirit of God, the spirit of grace—and become a member of the Kingdom of Heaven which was the favourite theme of Christ.

Because the nature of man was evil, God had to reveal Himself in His Son and overcome in Himself the propensities of the natural man, and was only thus able to obtain power to inspire natural man with something higher than himself, as the heavens are higher than the earth. This basic truth is the reason for the conflict, specially of the Christ and of all men of all ages who, according to more or less light obtained above their natural outlook, have risen above the brute to be reckoned among the Saints of God.

After his statement the Bishop goes on to qualify it, making it more misleading, for he calls 'reason' and 'conscience' 'natural faculties,' whereas they are surely now known to be the intrusion of God-given faculties into the natural man, Adam of *Genesis* being the first recorded recipient of these Divine gifts

In his next paragraph the Bishop states that 'those who in their conduct of human affairs would ignore or destroy religion are flying in the face of nature.' This also is misleading for men of all ages have had religious, observing forces felt to be *above* themselves, and surely most of us to-day would say that 'those who in their conduct of human affairs would ignore or destroy religion,' and the religion of Christ, are giving way in full force to the natural man, trusting to his natural powers, having discarded, for a time anyhow, the promptings of the Spirit of God.

Our human nature cannot be static; it is in itself so corrupt that it must either be transformed into the likeness of Christ (Christianity) or perish by its own corruption. If in our religion we do not begin with God's redeeming gift of grace to weak, sinful human nature, we shall get nowhere.

Basset Garth, Penn, Bucks. KATHLEEN PRYNNE.